

JPRS-TAC-86-001

2 JANUARY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

2 January 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: SDI Program 'Will Undermine' Arms Limitation (V. Bogachev; Moscow TASS, 13 Dec 85)	1
Moscow: U.S. ABM Shield Would Force Soviet Countermeasures (Moscow in English to North America, 30 Nov 85)	3
Soviet Academician Examines 'Provocative' SDI (B. V. Raushenbakh Interview; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 13 Nov 85)	5
TASS: U.S. Stance 'Main Hindrance' to Arms Control (Moscow TASS, 9 Dec 85)	10
USSR's Semeyko Criticizes U.S. Attitude Toward ABM Treaty (Lev Semeyko; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 47, Nov 85)	12
U.S. SDI 'Sharply' Enhances War Threat (Konstantin Sorokin; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 26 Nov 85)	14
USSR: SDI Found 'Incompatible' With World Security (Yuriy Solton; Moscow World Service, 5 Dec 85)	16
Moscow Comments on U.S. Opponents to SDI (Various sources, various dates)	18
Scientists' Opinion	18
Military Experts Cited	18
U.S. Congressman Cited	19
TASS: SDI Cooperation With Other States Violates Accords (Moscow TASS International Service, 7 Dec 85)	20
USSR Comment on U.S.-UK Memorandum of Understanding on SDI (Various sources, various dates)	21
'Contrary to Interests of Peace'	21
'Cancer Virus'	22
'Flagrant Violation'	23
'Dangerous New Step'	24
'Words Do Not Correspond to Actions', by A. Maslennikov Shultz Visit	25
	26

USSR's Borin on UK Conservatives' Pro-U.S., SDI Stance (Nikoliiy Borin; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 4 Dec 85)	27
USSR: Businessmen 'Baffled' by Reagan Plan To Share SDI (Moscow in English to North America, 3 Dec 85)	29
U.S. Arms Firms Prefer Profits to Peace (Moscow TASS, 30 Nov 85)	31
TASS Comment on Continued U.S. Development of SDI (Moscow TASS, 4 Dec 85)	33
DOD Announces Contract	33
Self-Interest Prevails	33
'Speeding Up' Space-Based Reactor	34
Undersecretary Ikle Cited	34
Soviet Comment on FRG Debate Over SDI Participation (Various sources, various dates)	36
'Camouflaging U.S. Intentions'	36
Weinberger's Visit to FRG, by Aleksandr Zholkver	37
FRG Bundestag Discussion	38
Congressional Findings Published	38
NATO Deputy Chief Sees SDI Endangering 'Flexible Response' (Ekkehard Kohrs; Bonn GENERAL ANZEIGER, 22 Oct 85)	40
FRG's Genscher Favors Discussing SDI at NATO Meeting (Hamburg DPA, 12 Dec 85)	42
FRG's DIE WELT Says Government Favors SDI Participation (Various sources, 9 Dec 85)	43
DIE WELT Article	43
Decision Expected 'Next Week'	43
FRG's Ruehe Statement on SDI Leads to 'Party Clashes' (Hamburg DPA, various dates)	44
Report on Ruehe Statement	44
CDU Deputies Comment	44
FRG Television Commentator on Bonn's SDI Decision (Guenther von Lojewski; Hamburg ARD Television Network, 11 Dec 85)	45
Dumas Argues Against SDI at WEU Meeting (Pierre Darcourt; Paris LE FIGARO, 5 Dec 85)	46
French Research, Technology Minister Curien on Eureka (Wubbo Tempel; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 23 Oct 85)	48

Canadian Participation in SDI Through NORAD Considered (Jeff Sallot; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 7 Nov 85)	52
Canadian Defense Minister Nielsen Denies NORAD, SDI Link (Jeff Sallot; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 19 Nov 85) ...	54
Canadian Scientists Federation Official on Role in SDI (John Honderich; Toronto THE SUNDAY STAR, 10 Nov 85) ..	55
Canadian Group Indicates Support for SDI (Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 8 Nov 85)	58
Canada: Visiting Soviet Scientist Warns Against SDI (Hugh Winsor; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 19 Oct 85) ...	59
Tokyo Correspondent Interviewed on SDI (Akira Furumoto; Tokyo TOKYO SHIMBUN, 14 Nov 85)	60
Beijing Review on Space Arms Rivalry (Sa Benwang; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 49, 9 Dec 85) ..	63

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG's Brandt on Geneva Summit, Talks in Washington (Hamburg DPA, 24 Nov 85)	67
FRG's Ehmke Says Partial Cruise Withdrawal 'Feasible' (Hamburg DPA, 23 Nov 85)	68
FRG's Kohl Expresses Support for Geneva Summit (Hamburg DPA, 6 Dec 85)	69
Norwegian Papers React to Summit With Cautious Optimism (Various sources, 22 Nov 85)	70
Denmark's SDP Security Spokesman Calls Summit a Breakthrough (Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 22 Nov 85)	71
Setubal Speaks at Shevardnadze Luncheon in USSR (Olavo Setubal; Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO, 10 Dec 85)	72

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRC Reaffirms Stand on Biological, Bacterial Weapons (Hong Kong AFP, 28 Nov 85)	76
--	----

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Norwegian Foreign Ministry Asks for Broader European Security (Morten Fyhn; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 25 Nov 85)	77
---	----

RELATED ISSUES

USSR's Zagladin on USSR Peace, Disarmament Actions (V. V. Zagladin; Moscow OSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI, No 6, Nov-Dec 85)	80
FRG's Bahr, USSR's Tolkunov Comment on Relations (Hamburg DPA, 12 Dec 85)	99
Canadian Pugwash Group Urges Nuclear-Weapons Freeze (Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 6 Nov 85)	100
Canadian Demonstrators Rally Against Arms Race (Paul Bilodeau; Toronto THE SUNDAY STAR, 27 Oct 85)	101

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: SDI PROGRAM 'WILL UNDERMINE' ARMS LIMITATION

LD131907 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 13 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 13 TASS--By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Persistently trying to prevent the militarization of outer space, advancing large-scale initiatives aimed at banning the deployment of strike space weapons in near-earth space, the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that there exist no contradictions that would fatally doom the USSR and the United States to confrontation, the more so war. However, the heightening of military rivalry between the sides, should an arms race be spread to new areas, including outer space, will sharply enhance the risk of nuclear war in which there will be neither the victor nor the vanquished.

Washington's arguments that the U.S. anti-missile systems in space will be "purely defensive" stand up to no criticism. Scholars question the efficiency and reliability of the space weapons, currently being devised in the United States, in hitting missiles in flight. There are no doubts, however, that the killer satellites, developed under the American "star wars" programme, will be able to destroy stationary targets on earth, including missiles in silos.

There are grounds to believe that the Pentagon is planning to deploy over Soviet territory a large part of its strike space armaments in the hope of ensuring the establishment of a first strike potential aimed to disarm socialist countries.

The Pentagon's calculations to achieve military superiority by deploying armaments in space are built on sand. The Soviet Union will find effective means to counter these arms systems. The response will be sufficiently quick and less costly than the American programme. But these measures will be forced on the Soviet Union. The USSR is deeply convinced that mutually acceptable, verifiable accords on the limitation and reduction of armaments, rather than new destabilizing weapons in limitless outer space, are the best shield against the nuclear war menace.

The implementation of the American "star wars" programme will undermine the entire process of the limitation and reduction of armaments--it is senseless to reduce arms over a comparatively limited area of earth territory, while

opening the door to systems of mass annihilation in the limitless expanses of near-earth space.

New channels of the arms race will emerge, including those capable of overcoming anti-missile defences. The ABM Treaty, one of the most effective barriers in the way towards an all-out nuclear war, will collapse.

Even a realistic appraisal of the balance of strategic forces will become impossible, to say nothing of maintaining stability. Developments will go out of control, mistrust and suspicion between countries will sharply grow, the risk of nuclear war as a result of a miscalculation, faults in warning systems and communications will increase many times.

The militarization of space, which some circles in the West describe as a "defensive programme," the development of strike space armaments may generate among some "hot heads" in Washington a dangerous illusion of the immunity of aggression.

There is still a chance to stop the dangerous developments in space. Tomorrow, this will be far more difficult to do. The summit meeting in Geneva showed that the positions of the sides on problems of war and peace have points of contact, that there are opportunities for looking for mutually acceptable solutions on limiting and reducing armaments.

It is important today as never before that the sides reaffirm by their practical deeds their commitment to the principles endorsed in the Soviet-American statement in Geneva. The Soviet Union is prepared to observe in good faith all the accords reached in Geneva, to see to it that the dialogue with the United States be continued in a constructive spirit and result in concrete measures for diminishing the risk of nuclear war.

The world public rightfully hope that the American side will come to the realization of the need for concrete coordinated measures for curtailing the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1200

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW: U.S. ABM SHIELD WOULD FORCE SOVIET COUNTERMEASURES

LD301540 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 30 Nov 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] In his speech before parliament on Wednesday the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, gave a bit by bit analysis of the Geneva summit. The Soviet Union and the United States achieved agreements on a number of key problems of security. The summit showed, however, that the American side is still unready for ending the arms race. Washington does not want to prevent an arms race in outer space, which blocks the introduction of deep cuts in nuclear weapons. According to many scientists and other experts the SDI program, if realized, would have grave consequences on the strategic situation and international politics. If the United States deployed a comprehensive system of antiballistic missile defense or some combat elements of such a system it would violate the ABM Treaty of 1972.

An American ABM shield in space would compel the Soviet Union to take countermeasures in the fields of both offensive and defensive weapons. As a result the amount of weaponry would increase immeasurably. This would be a serious blow to the arms control process. The United States and the Soviet Union would certainly not benefit in terms of security. The arguments in favor of star wars are full of contradictions. The SDI's proponents speak of a defense system that would be 95 percent foolproof but the 5 percent gap they allow for would mean scores of nuclear warheads let through by the ABM umbrella. What is more, the SDI system would be meant for defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles but it would be scarcely effective if used against other nuclear systems, like submarine-launched ballistic missiles, strategic bombers, and cruise missiles.

There have been attempts to convince the public that space weapons would render nuclear arms obsolete. At the same time efforts are made to estimate the possible effect of a conflict on the United States but where is the declared peaceful nature of the SDI? The only means to try out the SDI system would be in actual combat. With the growing use of computers the chances of a conflict through accident have greatly increased, so much so that it seems hardly possible to ensure world safety with all that sophisticated technology. This all shows that a space-based ABM defense system must be effective only if its possessor would try to use it for escaping retaliation for a first nuclear strike.

In his star wars speech on 23 March 1983 President Reagan justly said that if either side went on to perfect and build up its defensive arms along with creating a space ABM system this might be seen by the other side as fostering an aggressive policy. But that is exactly what is happening in the United States. In their long-term military plans the Americans call for a wide range of projects to be carried out under the SDI at the same time they leave no loopholes for cuts in strategic programs. Perhaps they believe that these programs could be set into reverse on short notice but might it not be more logical to start reducing arms instead of preparing their country and the whole world for yet another spurt in the race to defensive space weapons that would cost hundreds of billions of dollars?

In his speech at the Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev said this country and the United States had no other option but to learn the great art of living together. There are states in the world that by virtue of their military, economic, scientific and technological potential bear a special responsibility for the world's development. According to the Soviet leader such a responsibility, which is far from being a privilege, lies above all with the Soviet Union and the United States.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1200

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN EXAMINES 'PROVOCATIVE' SDI

PM151045 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with academician B. V. Raushenbakh by Kim Smirnov under the "Scientist's Opinion" rubric: "The Cost of A Mistake in the Nuclear Age" -- date and place not specified]

[Text] [Smirnov] Boris Viktorovich, the public in many states, sober-minded politicians, and scientists are joining unanimously in opposing the "star wars" program, which is put forward by the current U.S. administration under the name "strategic defense initiative" (SDI). What are the reasons for and arguments behind scientists' opposition to this program?

[Raushenbakh] The main reason is that it is not simply obvious to scientists by also /PRECISELY/ [capitalized word between slantlines printed in boldface] known that SDI is a path not to peace but to war.

Hardly had President Reagan announced the so-called "strategic defense initiative" than there was a dual reaction to his speech. The 'average American' was highly sympathetic to this idea. Outwardly it all seemed tempting: The proposal was to deploy above the United States a gigantic shield which would prevent even a single missile reaching its territory. So why should Americans oppose it?

But quite unexpectedly for the U.S. Administration and for the ordinary citizen, lulled by its bright promises, the scientists of the whole world abruptly opposed this idea. And not just Soviet and West European scientists but U.S. scientists, too, en masse.

What is happening? Why is Reagan's initiative opposed by the Federation of American scientists, Princeton University, and a number of other major scientific centers? It is precisely because they are /MAJOR/ [Capitalized words between slantlines printed in boldface] scientific centers, major scientists, and major science. They are accustomed to examining the first principles of phenomena.

Scientists, perhaps before anyone else, saw and loudly stated that this entire "defense" initiative is the most typical bluff. First, they showed the technological groundlessness of all these laser and beam weapons and the

whole series of other types of weapons in space. Specialists quickly "calculated" that at present it is unrealistic to try to create a reliable anti-nuclear shield using these means and that it is not clear whether it will be possible in 10-15 years, and they came to the conclusion that the U.S. Administration is simply hoodwinking the public by claiming the opposite. The incredible cost of this adventure was also revealed. It is true that different assessments produce different figures. But they always run to hundreds of billions! Some say \$100 billion. Others say \$400 billion. Some believe that it will be even more. But the most important thing is that scientists show that the creation of this system will lead to the destabilization of the world situation and an increase in the danger of nuclear conflict.

So the U.S. Administration is "painting" a picture in the U.S. public's mind of an idyllic antimissile umbrella above the country's entire territory. Scientists convincingly dispel this illusion, and armed, as it were, with figures, they show that this initiative cannot create any umbrella or shield over America. Calculations convincingly demonstrate that in the last resort it is possible to defend individual points, strategic missile launch positions, for example, but by no means the entire territory, not even all the vital centers of the United States. First, because total defense is impossible. Second, there is a whole series of types of weapons which in practice cannot be destroyed for certain by using the projected system. Bombers and cruise missiles, for example.

The "defense" initiative is particularly dangerous because it creates and encourages the illusion of the advantage of a first strike. This point was well and accurately made in a number of recent speeches by Soviet leaders and in publications in the world's press, particularly in IZVESTIYA. And for that reason I do not need to examine SDI's provocative character in greater detail now.

[Smirnov] The economic and scientific potentials of the United States and the USSR are impressive and are developing very dynamically. How can the idea be formed that it is possible to create an impenetrable anti-nuclear shield and, as a result, gain unilateral military advantages without taking account of the other side's development prospects?

[Rauschenbakh] This is a mistake which was programmed into SDI's fundamental principles. And it was immediately noticed by scientists. Indeed, only the very naive can be made to believe that the USSR will sit idly by, full of emotion, watching while the United States constructs this shield. It is not that we are incapable of finding a response. If necessary there will be a response, of course. Research shows that destroying the shield presents no particular problem. But that is not why we call for a peaceful space.

We proceed from the evident truth that this madness -- the unrestrained space arms race, which may also give impetus to the race in offensive weapons -- can and must be stopped before it is too late. There is still time, as was said in Kramer's celebrated cautionary movie "On the Beach." It is simply impossible to predict right now what form this race -- with no end in sight -- will take.

[Smirnov] The practice of all postwar decades demonstrates the objective fact that various U.S. Administrations have sought to forge ahead in the creation of new weapon types but that the Soviet Union has always found an adequate response to these "initiatives." Is it not senseless to try to secure military advantages for oneself today when the level of development of fundamental and applied research work in the leading scientific and technical powers is such that the very logic of research leads one country's scientists to what has already been discovered in the other?

[Raushenbakh] Yes, it is senseless. It is obvious that neither side will ever have the ultimate weapon. The fundamental laws of physics and chemistry, on which the renewal of military hardware is based, are well known to both sides. It is simply impossible to invent something which will leave one side in utter disarray. What one of the opposing sides acquires today, the other side will unfailingly acquire tomorrow.

[Smirnov] Why is the U.S. Administration so stubbornly trying to transfer the arms race to space?

[Raushenbakh] I believe that it is simply implementing the strategy of the military-industrial complex which brought it to power. And the main impetus here comes from the colossal profits which this complex gets from a new arms race spiral, one which is dangerous for mankind. Today -- superprofits, tomorrow -- who knows! War, if it comes (and suppose it does not) is a matter for tomorrow. As for today there are billions of dollars on the table. Why not take them?

This is a very dangerous "philosophy" and psychology. The "philosophy" of the ostrich hiding its head in the sand. If specific people take the money from the table in the hope that no one will notice and that there will be no consequences that, ultimately, is a matter for their conscience, their observance of the moral and legal norms. This is quite different matter. We are talking about the fate of mankind and the planet.

There are historical precedents when orienting the national economy solely toward war created the appearance of securing profits for businessmen and bread and work for ordinary people. But we know well how tragically that ended for the people.

Nevertheless, the current situation is unprecedented. Because we are talking about the ability to think in the nuclear age and to understand what can and cannot be done in that age. It is impossible to think now as people did in the Stone Age or even in the last war. A stone age tribal leader's mistake could mean at worst, the tribe's destruction. The inability to think soberly, such as Germany's fascist leaders showed, cost tens of millions of human lives. The cost of that inability now is the life of mankind.

[Smirnov] The present-day technological level of production has risen to such a point that man's physical and mental potential is becoming exhausted and he is being forced to transfer those functions to automatic machines. In the peace-time economy this is ultimately a boon. But what about in the military technologies, particularly those which will form the basis of SDI?

[Raushenbakh] In the military technologies each new level of automation is a new step toward war, toward the increased likelihood of its accidental occurrence.

This factor is usually mentioned less than the rest. But it is perhaps the most terrifying factor in all this playing with nuclear fire. The research of a number of U.S. universities and European scientists shows (and Soviet specialists have produced mathematical estimates in this area) that Reagan's SDI cannot work according to the conventional military scheme.

Let us imagine, for example, that the missiles have been launched. The President has been informed. The decision to retaliate has been taken. This sequence, which currently exists, becomes pointless in the present instance. According to U.S. calculations it should take 100-300 seconds from the missiles' appearance above the atmosphere to their destruction. In that time the missiles have to be detected and hit. There is no time to inform the President. Automated systems will take the decisions and begin war. The President and the political leadership will no longer be able to play a role in it.

Of course, only automatic machines can respond to other automatic machines at the necessary speed. What happens if the other side also creates the necessary automated systems? Mankind's fate will be placed in the hands of the machines. This is a very astounding situation which is appearing on the horizon and it is extremely dangerous.

You and I both know from our own personal experience of how automatic machines operate in everyday life and at work that they can make mistakes. We know that not only household appliances but also computers malfunction. Well, supposing we apply this to the implementation of the "star wars" program?

The problem of the accidental unleashing of nuclear conflict is becoming extremely acute and is now becoming paramount with some researchers. They confirm that when both sides have created these very complex automated systems, mankind's fate will be in the hands not of people but of machines. And machines go wrong. The more complex they are, the more likely errors are. These automated systems are supposed to work for decades without failing once. That is unrealistic.

The likelihood of catastrophe is increased all the more because in this instance we have to examine the aggregate of two uncoordinated automated systems in opposition to one another. Full-scale joint tests should be held according to the rules for developing systems of this kind. That would be logical in a peaceful international project. But in this particular instance it is impossible! The United States is not going to give its automated system to the Soviet Union for the latter to adapt its retaliatory measures to it. And vice versa.

Thus there will be two unchecked, uncoordinated systems at work. And the likelihood of malfunctions in such systems is even greater. This not only means that the reliability of the two technical systems will fall dangerously.

It also means that there is an increasing likelihood of the accidental triggering of war which, in all its foreseeable forms, could end in the destruction of human civilization.

There have already been instances when the U.S. services raised false alarms, mistaking flocks of wild geese and so forth for Soviet bombers. But on each occasion people had enough time and sense to work out what was really happening. But here there will be no time! In the event of a fatal mistake or technical error the machines will begin war without asking anyone.

[Smirnov] So it turns out that machines created by man can destroy him themselves? A science fiction story comes to mind in this context. The author is in a scientist's house and sees the scientist's double, a genetic copy, preserved in a huge jar. He is horrified at such an immoral and inhuman creation, of course: "How could you create a living being, a man, and then kill him?" The scientist replied: "What makes you think I created him? He created me." Does this gloomy phantasmagoria not call to mind the situation which you have just outlined?

[Raushenbakh] Yes, it is very similar. But let us hope that man will have enough reason not to entrust total control of his fate to machines which have gotten out of control. Although, of course, the idea of transferring military confrontation to space is itself the kind of gloomy phantasmagoria which even the most pessimistic science-fiction writers have not thought up yet.

By the way, the very concept of "star wars" entered political use from science fiction. Such wars have been waged in science fiction for a long time, since H. G. Wells' "War of the Worlds" and earlier. But here is a characteristic feature. In "star wars," which was conceived by science fiction writers, the struggle was always waged by earth as a planet and mankind as a whole against an aggressive civilization from another planet. It did not enter any writer's head to create "star wars" among people themselves and among the continents and countries of earth. That is so preposterous, absurd, and unnatural that the human imagination simply has not gone that far.

Space, even by the technical essence of its development, unites the peoples rather than dividing them. For example, an aircraft cannot cross a state's border without special agreement. But satellites overfly all continents and cross all borders. And this is legalized by international agreements. It is technically impossible to build a spacecraft which would only fly within a state's borders. A satellite is something belonging to the whole planet. It may be launched by America or by the Soviet Union. This does not change its planetary nature. The earth will be perceived from on board the satellite as a single entity.

It seems to me that as we go ever deeper into space the more this will be a path uniting people. That is perfectly natural! Only an utterly corrupt mind can see space flights as a path to military confrontation. The road to space can and must remain a road to peace.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: U.S. STANCE 'MAIN HINDRANCE' TO ARMS CONTROL

LD100029 Moscow TASS in English 2344 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 9 December TASS -- TASS news analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

The "star wars" plans are fraught with a new, extremely dangerous twist in the arms spiral -- this is the conclusion which was drawn by the Association of Jurists of New York, one of the biggest cities in the United States, as a result of two-year long studies.

The association notes in its report that the programme of creating an ABM system with space based elements will undermine the Soviet-American 1972 ABM Treaty and will lead to uncontrolled rivalry in the build up of both offensive and defensive armaments, unlimited spending of means and growth of danger. Consolidation of the ABM Treaty, which is the most important and successful treaty for control over armaments, is the only reasonable alternative to the "star wars."

The Pentagon meanwhile is speeding up in every way the work to develop strike space armaments. As was reported today by the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN, U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger intends to request Congress that approximately 4,900 million dollars be included into the budget of 1987 fiscal year for Strategic Defence Initiative research. If this attempt is crowned with success, the newspaper stresses, allocations for the programme will double, as compared with the 2,500-2,700 million dollars that Congress intends to approve for this fiscal year.

Attempts of militarisation of outer space encounter firm condemnation in the United States itself. It should be noted that 1,300 prominent American scientists, and also many senators, religious leaders, representatives of broad public, trade unions, women's and youth organizations have already declared against the arms race being spread to outer space.

The sober-minded people are fully aware that the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative planning deployment of a broad-scale ABM system with space elements, is not defensive. It adds to the threat of war, it threatens human civilization with a pernicious catastrophe.

The intention to put weapons into outer space is extremely dangerous to all peoples of the world without exception. Exactly therefore the Soviet Union proposed above all, to fully ban strike space armaments, since the beginning of the arms race in outer space will strengthen nobody's security. Under the cover of a space "shield" nuclear offensive systems will become still more dangerous.

The appearance of strike space systems might turn the present-day strategic balance into strategic chaos, entail a feverish arms race in all areas, undermine the ABM Treaty, one of the most important foundations for its limitation. Mistrust between countries will grow and security will be considerably impaired.

The stand taken by the American side at the recent summit talks in Geneva on the "star wars" question is the main hindrance on the way towards an agreement on control over armaments. And this is not only the Soviet viewpoint. The governments of France, Denmark, Norway, Greece, Netherlands, Canada and Australia have refused to participate in SDI. Space armaments are by no means defensive. There is every indication that the U.S. anti-missile space system is intended not as a "shield" but as part of a single offensive complex. Substantial reductions of nuclear armaments are impossible without a full ban on strike space systems. This should be realised full well in the United States.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S SEMEYKO CRITICIZES U.S. ATTITUDE TOWARD ABM TREATY

PM051535 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 47, Nov 85 pp 22-23

[Article by Lev Semeiko: "Unfailingly Observe the Treaty" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] Early this year the White House put out a 15-page document on the Strategic Defence Initiative, with the President's own signature affixed to the foreword. It claims that the programme for the modernization of strategic offensive arms (read: rearmament) is designed to enhance deterrence and stability. Only a few days ago Paul Nitze, special arms control adviser to the President and secretary of state, said again that the SDI offered "potential benefit for strategic stability." In other words, U.S. leaders believe that strategic stability is to be strengthened primarily by building up the U.S.A.'s strategic might -- both offensive and defensive -- by stepping up the arms race and not by putting an end to it.

This gives a better insight into the U.S. Administration's real attitude towards the ABM Treaty. It is a fact that the treaty has imposed maximum restrictions on the ABM systems of both sides, and this makes the treaty extremely significant in reinforcing strategic stability and international security. It was rightly pointed out that maximum limitation of ABM systems threatens the aggressor with inevitable destruction as a result of retaliatory attack. **INEVITABLY, MUTUAL ASSURED DESTRUCTION HAS BEEN AND CONTINUES TO BE A BASIC FACTOR CONTRIBUTING TO STRATEGIC STABILITY**, though this is not the best way of preserving peace. The best method here is a balance of confidence, and not a balance of terror. And the U.S.S.R. is urging the U.S. to adopt such a balance of confidence. However, **REALITY MUST BE FACED, THE REALITY, THAT IS, OF THE EXISTENCE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS. SINCE THEY EXIST, NO EFFORT SHOULD BE SPARED TO PREVENT THEIR USE, AND RULE OUT ALL POSSIBLE MOTIVES FOR SUCH USE.** In other words, the purpose is not only to maintain, but also to strengthen strategic stability.

THE ABM TREATY HELPS MAKE THE STRATEGIC SITUATION MUCH MORE PREDICTABLE. Limiting the ABM potential of both sides to one ABM complex each, intended to cover only one region, makes it unnecessary to engage in a strategic offensive arms race with a view to neutralizing an ABM system. In other words, a treaty taking account of the close interconnection between offensive and defensive arms makes it possible adequately to foresee the development of a strategic situation and thus ensure its stability. The parties proceeded precisely from this premise when they laid down in the preamble to the treaty that "effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons."

The SDI programme destroys all this. If the "star wars" initiative is realized, it would result in an offensive and defensive arms race of unpredictable scale and character. Therefore, it would be impossible to foresee the development of the strategic situation. No wonder the U.S. Administration has been trying to prove the contrary. The White House wants the SDI to appear more attractive from the standpoint of stability. In particular, it is claimed that uncertainty in the appraisal of the strategic situation (if the SDI is implemented) would deter either side from launching an attack, because its outcome would be unknown.

This premise is utterly unsound. It is in just such uncertain conditions that hot-heads would wish to prove that, in a nuclear game, it is worth staking everything, because the Americans, protected by a shield, would, with virtually absolute certainty, counter the surviving Soviet missiles. (It would be appropriate to mention that under the terms of the currently effective ABM Treaty such "proof" is out of the question.)

Another important point. The ABM Treaty reduces the strategic balance analysis first and foremost to an analysis of the strategic offensive arms balance (the Soviet approach provides for an analysis of the balance of the U.S.S.R.'s and the U.S.A.'s strategic nuclear potentials.) There is no ABM defence potential capable of protecting the respective territories. IT IS PRACTICALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO GRASP THE COMPLEXITIES INVOLVED IN A BALANCE OF STRENGTH ANALYSIS, WHEN IT IS NECESSARY TO CALCULATE NOT ONLY OFFENSIVE, BUT ALSO DEFENSIVE POTENTIALS, AND ALSO TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THEIR INTERACTION AND INTERDEPENDENCE. Indeed, some people could then become prey to illusions of superiority which might prove fatal to humanity. In this context strategic stability would be reduced virtually to zero.

Finally, the aspect of disarmament. In the preamble to the treaty the parties agreed that the limitation of ABM systems would help create "more favourable conditions for further negotiations on limiting strategic arms." The practical experience of Soviet-U.S. relations has confirmed this. It became possible to sign the SALT II treaty. TODAY IT HAS BECOME POSSIBLE (provided the U.S. displays the political will) RADICALLY TO REDUCE THE U.S.S.R.'S and the USA's nuclear potential capable of reaching each other's territory. If, of course, the ABM Treaty remains in force and is unfailingly observed.

It is hardly necessary to prove that such a major reduction of nuclear arms would greatly enhance strategic stability, both its military and political aspects. TODAY IT IS VITAL NOT ONLY NOT TO QUESTION THE FUNDAMENTAL IMPORTANCE OF THE ABM TREATY, BUT ALSO TO TAKE ALL POSSIBLE MEASURES TO REINFORCE ITS STABILIZING POWERS. The U.S.S.R. has sent forth these measures: not to deploy weapons of any type in space, to ban the use of military force both in and from space against the earth, to ban and destroy anti-satellite weapons, and to ensure international cooperation in peaceful space exploration in conditions of its nonmilitarization. With these measures in force, the concept of "star peace," as an essential condition for peace on earth, would be realized. Strategic stability would then be radically enhanced.

/12929

CS0: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

U.S. SDI 'SHARPLY' ENHANCES WAR THREAT

LD262111 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 26 Nov 85

[Konstantin Sorokin Commentary]

[Text] Assessing the results of the Soviet-American summit, the British prime minister said the meeting has benefited all -- the United States and the Soviet Union, the Western alliance and other nations of the planet. Indeed, the situation in the world has improved since the Geneva meeting. At that meeting, a start was made for the search of ways to better Soviet-American relations, relations which to a great extent determine the political climate in the world. Yet no practical solutions to the cardinal problems of today were found at the meeting and there is a lot of work ahead to fill Geneva's impulse with real contents. This fully applies to the problem of mutual and general security. Both sides said they do not seek military superiority and feel that there will be no winners in a nuclear war. They also called for greater progress at the talks on nuclear and space armaments, where the task of preventing an arms race in space and halting the arms race on earth should be solved. Further headway to concrete results was blocked by major differences on principled issues, first of all the nature and consequences of the American program known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. The American President continued to advertise the SDI as a basis of stability and lasting peace in the future. London supported Washington's thesis that the program provides for the development of a purely defensive weapon. It is claimed that such a weapon won't threaten anyone, but will make nuclear weapons impotent and will speed up their destruction and the process of talks.

Yet such a scheme amounts to indulging in illusions. The key factor it fails to mention produces quite a different picture. The complex line of defense in space cannot be sufficiently reliable or effective. It would be more realistic to suggest the use of a space antiballistic missile system for unleashing a nuclear war by the holder of such a shield. In such a case he would deliver a nuclear strike first in a bid to destroy a bigger part of the retaliation potential of the other side and thus weaken its retaliation.

There are other factors indicating that space weapons are intended for aggression. Having launched the SDI program the United States does not give up the military doctrine in favor of using nuclear weapons first. Simultaneously, it continues work on at least five projects involving the development and deployment of offensive nuclear armaments designed to deliver a disarming strike. Besides, the Pentagon intends to unite the command of offensive and

so-called offensive operations [as heard] in keeping with the concept of a nuclear space war.

It is obvious that the road offered by the United States will sharply enhance the threat of war. The Soviet Union proposes a different way. First of all, a ban on all space weapons should be agreed upon and measures should be taken to prevent an arms race in all directions. The Soviet Union and the United States could then work out a mutually acceptable formula for reducing by 50 percent nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory, and then by drawing the other nuclear powers into the process it would be possible to make further advances towards radical reductions. This is the only sound and realistic program. Yet, of course, the Soviet Union cannot carry it out single-handedly. Will Washington cover its part of the road? Will it first of all renounce its most perilous logic of Star Wars? All this depends to a great extent on the position of the American allies.

Regrettably, one of them, Britain, has already agreed to take part in the SDI -- which certainly worsens the chances of concrete action on the Geneva agreements. To promote and even to preserve the Geneva impulse, it is probably not only the American leaders who should assess their position thoroughly and realistically.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: SDI FOUND 'INCOMPATIBLE' WITH WORLD SECURITY

LDO51503 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 5 Dec 85

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The United States Administration has announced that it will not lower the rates of growth of military spending even if it is the only way to reduce the astronomical budget deficit. Yuriy Solton comments:

This fully relates to efforts in the framework of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, commonly known as the "star wars" program. There are reports that the Pentagon has even stepped up the implementation of the project.

General Abrahamson, who is in charge of the program, announced this at a recent conference that gathered representatives of the Defense Department and military corporations. The Pentagon, Gen Abrahamson said, is conducting tests with models imitating nuclear missiles. This involves a chemical laser and kinetic energy installations. The AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY magazine says the Energy Department, which controls the implementation of some secret military programs, is developing a space-based nuclear reactor. This reactor will play the role of major energy source for strike space weapons.

It is noteworthy that certain Washington officials have made an attempt to revise the joint statement signed by the Soviet and American leaders in Geneva. The two sides agree, the statement says that the work at the talks on disarmament will be stepped up -- meaning the fulfillment of tasks set in the joint Soviet-American statement of 8th January, 1985, that is to preclude an arms build-up in space and to stop it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear weapons, and strengthen strategic stability. As for presidential adviser General Edward Rowny, in an interview for the ASSOCIATED PRESS he said that the Soviet Union and the United States would be able to start resolving the problem of a reduction in nuclear arsenals in earnest only when the Soviet side stopped linking such efforts with the renunciation by the United States of the "star wars" program.

It is no good to hope that in this issue of principle the Soviet Union will alter its stand. The USSR is ready for a radical reduction in nuclear arms with a view to gaining the ultimate goal, a total ban on them. It suggests to the United States that both sides reduce their strategic nuclear forces by one-half. This means thousands of nuclear warheads. But such a reduction is possible only on the condition of a ban on strike space weapons.

America's "star wars" program is incompatible with the interests of international security. It dooms nations to live for many years to come in the conditions of intensified build-up of military potentials and the further aggravation of world tensions. Its implementation might result in the loss of bases for resolving the problems of arms limitation and reduction and disarmament. The Soviet Union hopes that Washington hasn't yet said its last word, that political reason will triumph. Another outcome would bitterly disappoint all nations.

/12929

CS0: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW COMMENTS ON U.S. OPPONENTS TO SDI

Scientists' Opinion

LDO30032 Moscow TASS in English 2144 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Washington 2 December TASS -- "The space defence" system proposed by the current Washington administration and broadly known as the "star wars" programme may destabilize, the dangerous as it is, international situation, bring the world to the verge of a thermonuclear catastrophe. This opinion is drawn by the journal AEROSPACE AMERICA, which analyses the opinion of a number of leading American scientists and experts about the SDI.

Even the supporters of the "strategic defence initiative" programme admit, the journal points out, that if it is implemented, a number of projects of the "star wars" programme, such as the creation of super-powerful lasers, may be used not for "defence," but for launching the first strike against the enemy's outer space objects.

Many specialists in the USA, the AEROSPACE AMERICA says, are also concerned about the wish of the authors of the "star wars" programme to the computerize the taking of a decision on a start of combat operations. Recalling the frequent "false alarms" of the current American early warning system, the journal points out that the implementation of the "star wars" plans will create a situation in the world under which a malfunction in a microcircuit may cause a nuclear catastrophe.

Military Experts Cited

PN131343 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 12 Nov 85 p 3

[TASS report: "Contrary to the Treaty"]

[Text] Washington, 11 Nov -- Prominent military specialists -- R. MacNamara, former U.S. defense secretary, and G. Smith, former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. strategic arms limitation talks -- speaking during the NBC TV program "Meet the Press," have condemned the Washington administration's notorious "strategic defense initiative" (SDI). They pointed out that this program is aimed at upsetting the military equilibrium existing between

the two countries and undermining the fundamental Soviet-U.S. agreements in the arms limitation sphere.

If work within the "star wars" program framework continues, R. MacNamara stated, the United States will be "moving toward" creating [sozdaniye] the potential for delivering the first strike against the USSR. The Soviet Union, he noted, will never agree to limit its own strategic armaments if the United States is continuing work within the SDI framework.

If the administration is harboring plans for deploying ABM systems with space based elements, he further pointed out, we "are on the path toward renouncing the Soviet-U.S. 1972 ABM treaty." R. MacNamara recalled that six former U.S. Defense Secretaries had recently made a joint statement urging the U.S. Administration to "avoid actions which could undermine the ABM treaty and to reach an agreement in Geneva aimed at preventing its erosion." "Otherwise it will be impossible to reach agreement in the arms limitation sphere." R. MacNamara stressed, pointing out that the treaty is the "foundation of the offensive arms control process."

G. Smith noted in his statement that there are figures in the Reagan administration who pin their hopes on SDI as a means of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. Such a position is dangerous. And the USSR's concern regarding the "star wars" program is justified, the former head of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. SALT talks emphasized.

U.S. Congressman Cited

LD181136 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Text] Chicago 18 November TASS -- The 6th national conference of the nuclear weapons freeze campaign ended in Chicago with a mass rally. Addressing the rally, Edward Markey, a member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, strongly criticized the militarist policy of the administration. The U.S. President, he said, has been opposed to all the arms control accords ever made. Now he has come up with his "star wars" programme. It is perfectly obvious that the implementation of this programme in parallel with a nuclear arms build-up is aimed at preparing nuclear war, the congressman said.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: SDI COOPERATION WITH OTHER STATES VIOLATES ACCORDS

LDO71741 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 7 Dec 85

["The United States is Violating Existing Accords" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Dec (TASS) -- TASS commentator Andrey Biryukov writes: U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, after the signing in London of "The Memorandum on Mutual Understanding," envisaging the participation of Great Britain in the implementation of the "star wars" program stated the antimissile defense system with space-based elements could protect not only the United States, but also Western Europe.

This statement has drawn the attention of observers not only because it has once more confirmed Washington's intention to carry out plans to militarise space, including at the expense of linking up partners of the NATO bloc in this dangerous venture. In essence, the Pentagon chief has admitted that U.S. leaders firmly intend to continue a course for undermining the 1972 treaty between the USSR and the United States on limiting antimissile defense systems, which at that time reflected the understanding by both states of the need to repudiate the deployment of any kind of widescale antimissile defense systems.

As is well known, Article five of this treaty bans the creation, testing, and deployment of antimissile defense systems or components, whether sea-, air-, space- or mobile ground-based. Another article says that each side can deploy an antimissile defense system of only one single area. Finally, Article nine of this treaty has it in black and white: "In the aim of ensuring the viability, and effectiveness of the present treaty, each side binds itself not to pass on to other stages and not to site antimissile defense systems or components limited by the present treaty outside their own national territory."

The Soviet Union keeps strictly to its obligations under the antimissile defense treaty in general and in detail, and rigorously observes the spirit and letter of this most important document. But, the United States, in its aspiration to achieve global superiority, tries ever more often and ever more grossly to bypass or even infringe this agreement. Now Washington is openly drawing into its irresponsible and adventuristic policy other states too, promising them, some sort of "space shield" in violation of the existing understanding.

/12929
CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR COMMENT ON U.S.-UK MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON SDI

'Contrary to Interests of Peace'

LDO61730 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1627 GMT 6 Dec 85

[Text] London, 6 Dec (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports:

The Thatcher government has once again shown itself to be obedient in carrying out Washington's will, readily lending its backing to all its most dangerous and adventurous schemes. A "memorandum of understanding" was signed here today between Britain and the United States which provides for Britain's involvement in research work under the U.S. "star wars" program. This was announced at a press conference held jointly by M. Heseltine, the British defense secretary, and C. Weinberger, the U.S. defense secretary, who is on a visit to the British capital.

Under the document, a special "department for the participation" of Britain in the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" of the United States is immediately being set up at the British military department. Agreement has been reached on the mechanism which will regulate the involvement of British firms in research work to create [sozdaniye] a large-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements, and on the exchange of relevant information.

Speaking at the press conference, M. Heseltine said that the UK-U.S. memorandum is in agreement with the known accord reached between U.S. President R. Reagan and British Prime Minister M. Thatcher during their meeting in Camp David last December. He also asserted that the research work within the framework of SDI "does not go counter to" the 1972 Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting ABM systems. At the same time, M. Heseltine glossed over in silence the fact that the testing and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of a space ABM system that will inevitably follow such "research" will be a crude violation of the provisions of that treaty.

In turn, C. Weinberger repeated the Pentagon's mendacious allegations about the "defensive" nature of the "star wars" program by means of which Washington is counting on becoming able to deal a first nuclear strike against the USSR with impunity. The Pentagon chief expressed "satisfaction" at the signing of the memorandum noting that this fact was still further evidence of the existence of so-called "special relations" between the United States and Britain. And true it is: London has become the first of the Western European allies of the United States to give in to Washington's pressure and give official agreement to participate in the implementation of the most dangerous plans for the militarization of space.

Political observers note in this connection that hidden behind Whitehall's declaration of its "striving" for a normalization of the situation on the European continent is a policy which is contrary to the interests of peace and security. Prior to this, official London was the first to embark on the siting of cruise missiles on British soil, creating a lethal threat for millions of Britons in the event of a nuclear conflict. It is not fortuitous that, when describing such behavior by the Thatcher government, representatives of the opposition have repeatedly compared it with an "eager poodle."

In signing the memorandum with the United States, the Tories were circumventing parliament in view of the wide opposition to Britain's participation in the implementation of Washington's designs, on the part of British public and many politicians. In this connection N. Kinnock, the leader of the Labor Party, accused the M. Thatcher cabinet of giving in to pressure by the United States "with grovelling haste" and of not even considering it necessary to submit a draft of the memorandum for discussion by Great Britain's supreme legislative body. D. Healey, a member of the Labor "shadow cabinet," stressed that the "star wars" program, in whose realization the government of the Conservatives has decided to take part, is "a threat to peace throughout the world and the main obstacle along the road to disarmament."

'Cancer Virus'

LD072053 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 7 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 6 December TASS [dateline as received] -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

A "memorandum of understanding" with the United States has been signed in London today. It envisages Britain's participation in research under the U.S. "star wars" programme which is called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI). This was announced at a press conference which was held there jointly by British Defence Secretary Michael Heseltine and U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger who is visiting in Britain. The Tory Government has gone to this step in defiance of serious protests by the public at large and by scientists of their own country as well as by those in the whole of Western Europe. Putting it in medical terms, The Washington administration will undoubtedly use London's consent to cooperate in the space militarisation field mainly for the purpose of injecting the "cancer virus" of the SDI into the organism of the entire Western Europe.

This decision is quite unpopular, to Britain itself, in the first place, since it is connected with measures to transfer to outer space the race of arms, including nuclear, "exotic" and any other futuristic weapons of destruction, and not with a search for ways to remove the nuclear threat.

On the whole, the implementation of SDI projects undermines the very basis for solving the task of limiting and reducing arms and achieving disarmament. This is also a dangerous step to Britain, since participation in the U.S. military space programmes will make Britain's security still more fragile. Europe is oversaturated with nuclear and conventional arms already now and there are endeavours to add space strike weapons to that pile of arms.

The expectations that Britain's participation in the "star wars" programmes will bring sizeable profits to it and will revitalise the country's economy are, without

any doubt, illusory, too. There is hope, in particular, to get military orders to the tune of 1,200-1,500 million dollars. The estimates made by U.S. specialists show something else. Complete realisation of the SDI will cost the Pentagon approximately 1,000,000 million dollars. Comparing the above-mentioned figures, it is easy to see that Britain will get only crumbs of the pie. And it will not be easy to get them either. By now the number of U.S. firms participating in SDI-related programmes is 240 and list will continue to grow. The true masters of the SDI -- the military-industrial complex and the higher echelons of U.S. military production -- are now in command in the competitive struggle, and not the U.S. Administration which promises wonders to London. Consequently, London has no firm guarantees that it will turn to advantage SDI-related orders. But expenditures on new arms by Britain itself will undoubtedly grow many times over.

The U.S. Administration will compel its British partner to purchase U.S. space weapons in just the same way as it now induces it to spend huge funds on the purchase of U.S. "Trident" nuclear-powered submarines and missiles. But then Britain's economic position is far from fine and the prospects do not hold out anything reassuring.

And finally, there is yet another aspect which is the most important one in the light of possible headway in easing East-West tensions. The decision of the Tory Cabinet to join in the SDI runs counter to the spirit of the Geneva summit meeting. Firstly, the whole world expects that, after Geneva, there will be developments in the direction of detente, the relaxation of tension, an atmosphere of trust, and the curbing of the arms race. Secondly, during the discussion of the questions of the talks on nuclear and space arms by the leaders of the USSR and the USA in Geneva, the sides agreed that the work at the talks would be expedited, meaning the accomplishment of the tasks set out in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of January 8, this year, namely: to prevent an arms race in outer space and to end it on earth. London approvingly reacted to the efforts made in Geneva but nevertheless immediately joined in the U.S. "star wars" programme.

'Flagrant Violation'

LDO91934 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT 9 Dec 85

["The Thatcher Government and International Treaties" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 9 December TASS - By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev.

Sensing the anti-war sentiment in Britain, officials of the Thatcher Government from time to time state their support for the existing Soviet-American treaties on arms limitation and reduction and express their allegiance to the idea of political and military stability in Europe and the world as a whole. However, in practice the government of Britain not only unconditionally approves the policy of the ultra right-wing quarters in the United States toward undermining agreements with the U.S.S.R., it sometimes prods Washington toward violating the provisions of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT-2) and the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty).

For instance, in keeping with Article 12 of the SALT-2 the sides pledged not to bypass the provisions of the treaty through any state or states or in any other way. This article is important inasmuch as it prohibits the parties to the treaty from achieving

unilateral military advantages by transferring weapon systems that are limited by the treaty to its allies. In case the "ceiling" set by the SALT-2 treaty, say, on the ballistic missiles with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRV) is surpassed any of the sides must dismantle and destroy the MIRV missiles it has in excess of the limit of 1,200 units allowed by the terms of the agreement. It is prohibited to transfer to the allies any arms that exist in excess of the limits instead of destroying them.

In March 1982 the Government of Britain announced its decision to fit out four of its submarines with the Trident-2 missiles system with U.S.-Manufactured MIRV's. Soon after that Washington said it was ready to sell the missiles to Britain on "soft terms", although such nuclear systems are subject to limitation under SALT-2. Britain, thus, helps Washington to circumvent the provisions of the treaty. The United States evidently thinks it has the "right" not to dismantle its arms as required by the international agreements and to hand to its allies the systems it has in excess of the limit. At the same time Washington is known to refuse even to take account of Britain's nuclear arms in the overall balance of forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

It is clear that such a practice constitutes a flagrant violation of not only article 17, but also the spirit and the letter of the SALT-2 treaty as a whole.

Not so long ago Washington managed to secure Britain's official consent to participate in the realization of its plans for developing a large-scale space-based anti-ballistic missile defense. Having signed a corresponding agreement with the United States, the British government has demonstrated its readiness to become Washington's accomplice in breaching the Soviet-U.S. Agreement on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile systems. This agreement, signed in 1972, prohibits the parties to it from transferring ABM systems or their components to other states or deploying them outside their territories.

According to press reports, Washington promised to provide its ally not only with technical information, but also with individual ABM components in exchange for the right to use British scientists and British territory in its preparations for "star wars". This is another instance of violation of an arms limitation treaty by the United States and Britain.

The record of the present British Administration in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction, its practical decisions on problems of war and peace enable the Thatcher government to claim the doubtful laurels of the most loyal follower of Washington's aggressive doctrines in Western Europe.

'Dangerous New Step'

OW110757 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Dec 85

[From the Novosti Newscast: commentary by Sergey Alekseyev]

[Text] The world's public assesses the Anglo-U.S. agreement on cooperation in realizing the Star Wars program as a new dangerous step on the road to escalating the arms race. Here is what our commentator has to say: [Alekseyev] Hello, comrades: Since President Reagan made his so-called Strategic Defense Initiative program public in the spring of 1983, UK Prime Minister Thatcher has become probably the most active

supporter of this program among the NATO allies of the United States. Officially only doubts of the British Government as to the material benefits to the United Kingdom of participation in SDI hindered its decision to join the program. Now this obstacle has been removed. Judging by everything, the U.K. prime minister promised big profits to her financiers, industrialists, and scientists. As a matter of fact, the cost of implementing this program is estimated to be \$26 billion.

U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger also hastened to placate the British. At the document signing ceremony in London he declared -- and I cite: Soon Great Britain will receive considerable rewards, that now many British companies can expect profitable contracts with their U.S. partners. A British journalist, commenting on the ceremony, noted with some justification that it looked like a scene from school life. The pupil had pleased his master and now he was receiving pats on his back. Unfortunately, and primarily for the British people, similar scenes can be used to illustrate more than just the present crucial decision of London. The desire to be the first to demonstrate at any cost its support for the actions of official Washington regardless of how questionable they appear to be to the rest of the world, has practically become a distinctive feature of the British Conservative Government's foreign policy line. For example, look at this relations with the apartheid regime in the Republic of South Africa, the recent joint explosion of a nuclear device in the State of Nevada, and the decision to follow the United States in withdrawing from UNESCO. And now through the efforts of its leadership, the United Kingdom has become the first country in the world to officially agree to participate with the United States in the "star wars." This kind of obedience is dangerous, dangerous for Britain itself, and for the cause of peace in general.

'Words Do Not Correspond to Actions'

PM101435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[A. Maslennikov: "A New and Dangerous Step"]

[Text] The British Government has taken a new, extremely dangerous step along the path of stepping up the arms race. At a hastily convened ceremony in London, the U.S. and British defense ministers put their signatures to an Anglo-American agreement on cooperation in the development [razrabotka] of the research part of the "star wars" program.

The agreement (its specific contents are being kept secret) formulates the general rules by which British industrial companies, universities, and research institutes must be guided when concluding contracts with the American Administration on the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). A special directorate is being set up in the British military department for the purpose of coordinating these contacts. The British Government is thereby officially placing the scientific establishments and industrial potential of its country at the service of American plans to militarize outer space.

Commenting on the situation in which the signing of the agreement took place, British political observers note that it was signed only several hours after the completion of the many months of negotiations between representatives of the two countries in Washington. This haste was caused by the Thatcher government's wish to please its senior partner at all costs and, at the same time, to "set an example" to the other U.S. allies in the NATO bloc. As yet they are in no hurry to enter into these militarist plans.

Commentators here note that, in signing the agreement, U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger refused to make any pledge with regard to placing at the disposal of the British side new scientific and technical discoveries which may be made in the course of implementing the aforementioned program. Speaking after the signing of the agreement, he said that the fulfillment of future contracts will be subject to U.S. legislation relating to the export of technology.

N. Kinnock, leader of the Labor Party, described the signed agreement as a "dangerous and destabilizing step" totally at variance with the spirit of Geneva. He recalled that, under U.S. pressure, the British Government had just announced its withdrawal from UNESCO.

Having taken a dangerous step in the direction of "star wars," the British Government has virtually acknowledged that its words on slackening the arms race and reducing nuclear arsenals in Europe do not correspond to its practical actions. And these actions are by no means in the interests of Europe, or of Britain itself.

Shultz Visit

LD101748 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] London, December 10 TASS -- Talks have opened here today between British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who arrived on a one-day visit in London.

As is pointed out in the statement issued by the prime minister's office, much attention at the talks was devoted to East-West relations in the light of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, the situation in the field of arms control.

Yet, as observers note, the main subject on the agenda of the consultations was the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative".

It is pointed out here that Shultz came to London only a few days after the British Conservative Government signed with the Washington Administration a memorandum on mutual understanding providing for Britain's participation in research work under the "star wars" programme. Observers point out in this connection that the U.S. secretary of state intends to use the signing of the memorandum for bringing additional pressure to bear on the other West European countries with the aim of making them follow London's example and also join in the implementation of the Strategic Defence Initiative.

/12929

CS0: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S BORIN ON UK CONSERVATIVES' PRO-U.S., SDI STANCE

LD050158 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 4 Dec 85

[Commentary by Nikolay Borin]

[Text] American Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, summarizing the outcome of the recent NATO session in Brussels, said that so far Britain alone had expressed willingness to participate in the United States plans for militarizing outer space. Nikolay Borin comments.

The sympathy displayed for the "star wars" program by official London gave rise to no surprises after its enthusiasm over the idea of deploying American missiles in Europe manifested 2 years ago. After all, the Tory leaders, at their party convention, openly announced that theirs was a pro-American party. Therefore, it's not surprising that, being in sympathy with Washington's position, the British Government forgets about the interests of ordinary Britons. People and their place of abode in Britain today may be different but everywhere they come across the same problems -- unemployment, low educational level, poor health, privations, and crime. Such was the main conclusion made by Archbishop Ramsey, who accused the government of lacking compassion for the plight of the growing ranks of needy people.

While the British public extensively discussed Archbishop Ramsey's report on the continent in Brussels the British delegation advocated another costly channel for the arms race in outer space, undertook to build shelters for American troops in the advent of war, and endorsed colossal expenditures connected with stockpiling all kinds of weaponry in Western Europe. It did so with zeal, setting great hopes on special relations with the United States. In the meantime, those who proclaim their party pro-American should better study the American experience more closely.

William Gray, a member of the House of Representatives, said recently that growing defense spending swallowed jobs all over America. American labor unions, usually loyal to the government, have stated in their resolutions that the Reagan administration allocated fabulous sums of money for weapons and sharply reduced funds for social needs. What suffered mostly was health service and social insurance.

Even a new phenomenon has emerged in America, hunger on a mass scale. Such is the path of privations and sacrifices leading to "star wars" and to the programs for accelerated militarization in the United States. For Britain, however, it would be

simply catastrophic to join these projects, considering the fact that Britain's current military spending has absorbed hospital beds, pensions, reliefs, and jobs and led to wide outflow of capital and brain power needed for production growth in Britain itself.

Nevertheless, the outcome of NATO's session in Burssels confirm the pro-American stance taken by the Tories. If affection is capable of ignoring shortcomings, the bitter fruit of reality often leads to a sobering, though sometimes belated [sentence as heard]. This is what the Tories' Atlantic love might result in.

/12929

CS0: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: BUSINESSMEN 'BAFFLED' BY REAGAN PLAN TO SHARE SDI

LDO31802 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 3 Dec 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Top business executives and Pentagon officials are said to be baffled by the Reagan administration's promises to share space weapons technology with the Soviet Union as part of the scheme to gradually shift the reliance from offensive to defensive arms. Here are some details:

Well, at the conference on space technology in Colorado Springs (William Rector), the vice president of space systems at the General Dynamics, expressed his surprise in the following way: I just don't understand it, he said. It seems to run counter to everything else they're doing. It just doesn't make sense. There's much more to "star wars," or the Strategic Defense Initiative, that doesn't make sense. At his news conference in Geneva, and in the recent address to the Supreme Soviet or parliament, the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made it absolutely clear that if the door to an arms race in space was not slammed shut, military competition would acquire dire proportions. The arms race cannot be stopped if we add new weapons to the existing ones. The more so since the latter are being constantly perfected in terms of accuracy, yields, their capabilities to reach targets undetected by enemy air defenses, and so on.

For business executives, it's inconceivable that technological secrets can be shared with a competitor. This is true of any field of competition, military or civilian. Stealing secrets from others, or finding more legal ways of using the potential of others, yes. But it's never sharing with others. Military contractors who are in for windfall profits from "star wars" often say that they don't formulate any policies. They claim they act on orders from the government. However, in the case of "star wars," we have a combination of political decision to gain a sizable military advantage over the other side and a tremendous pressure from the military-industrial complex. For the leading arms manufacturers, the so called Strategic Defense Initiative is not only a gold mine, it's also a unique chance to establish themselves for many decades to come as a powerful force to be reckoned with by politicians to dissuade whoever makes an attempt to at least slow down the arms race and thus hurt their business, and to influence the American public and the mass media into accepting Soviet-American rivalry in almost each and every area as something inevitable.

In recent months there have been more meetings of Pentagon officials and top business executives involved in "star wars" than at any other time in the past. There have been more news conferences and interviews with the press than during the same period last year. The thrust of this campaign -- call it public relations, propaganda, or whatever -- is to convince that in the case of "star wars" military superiority goes hand

in hand with prestige, national pride, and honor. In other words, powerful forces are at play to keep "star wars" well lubricated and going. For them, political responsibility is a hollow sound. For them, the Geneva summit with its clear undertaking by both sides not to seek unilateral advantages is a brief political honeymoon of little practical value. When business executives are pressed by reporters about what's bad about sharing defensive technologies with others, they reply that individual components of the system can be turned into devastating offensive weapons to assist a nuclear first strike.

It looks like the spirit of Geneva and "star wars" are incompatible.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

U.S. ARMS FIRMS PREFER PROFITS TO PEACE

LD301148 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT 30 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow 30 November TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The more strongly and resolutely international public criticizes Washington's so-called "strategic defence initiative," whose implementation could play havoc with the present-day strategic balance, the more fiercely the U.S. military-industrial complex opposes the demands for non-militarization of outer space. What are the strongholds, in which the most zealous supporters of "star wars" have entrenched themselves?

In the USA, where militarism has become some kind of a foundation for both foreign policy and the economy, the world's biggest arms manufacturing industry has been created. The Pentagon's orders are implemented by 30,000 main contractors and more than 50,000 subcontractors. The main weapons systems and military equipment are manufactured by roughly 150 state-owned mills and nearly 4,000 big plants of private firms. According to the NEW YORK TIMES press service, the Pentagon has now concluded more than fifteen hundred contracts in connection with the implementation of the SDI, more than 60 percent of these contracts being implemented by ten biggest military-industrial corporations, which are some kind of a "nucleus" of the U.S. war industry.

They are above all six Californian military-industrial giants, which, as is well known, have played a very important role in promoting many top figures of the current Republican administration to Washington's political olympus. Among them are such giants of the arms manufacturing business as the "Lockheed," "Rockwell International" and "McDonnell-Douglas." Along with California's arms manufacturing tycoons taking an active part in the preparations for the "star wars" are such corporations as the "Boeing" and "Martin-Marietta," "Ford Aerospace" and "General Motors," "General Research" and "BDM".

The aggregate profit of the ten leading American arms manufacturing companies have increased 2.5 times over during the past five years. Hardly has Washington announced its outer space militarization programme, as the BUSINESS WEEK said that the rate of shares of the "Lockheed" jumped by eleven points in the stock market, of "Martin-Marietta" -- by eight points and "McDonald Douglas"

-- by seven points. In 1984 alone, California's military-industrial corporations secured orders worth 28.5 billion dollars, which is 11.2 billion dollars up on the figure of 1981. Not surprisingly, every prospect of a lessening of tensions causes a real panic among the American arms manufacturers. The military contractors are alarmed over the possible consequences of arms control, since talks between the superpowers may deprive them of lucrative contracts, the WASHINGTON POST wrote on the day when the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva opened.

The military-industrial corporations engaged in the implementation of the SDI are most closely linked with official Washington, the congress and the Pentagon brass hats. As is pointed out in a report issued in Washington by the public organization centre on budget and policy priorities, eighteen of the Pentagon's biggest contractors alone participating in the programme for the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles MX and development of "star wars" weapons have invested over the past two years 2.3 billion dollars into the election campaign of influential congressmen. "Lockheed" alone increased over the past four years its "contributions" to the election funds of the political parties by 325 percent. The boards of the companies can be viewed as offices sectors of the Defence Department, or, if one looks at it from another angle, the Defence Department can be viewed as a special office of the board of the major corporations, American publicist F. Landberg points out.

"There are quite a few people in the Pentagon, the military-industrial complex and the government who have to choose between peace, on the one hand, and profits, on the other, Gus Hall, the American Communist leader points out in the bulletin INFORMATION. And they will further choose profits, even if this means spreading the arms race into outer space and an escalation of the threat of nuclear destruction. This is in fact happening nowadays...

/12929
CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS COMMENT ON CONTINUED U.S. DEVELOPMENT OF SDI

DOD Announces Contract

LD040151 Moscow TASS in English 2124 GMT 4 Dec 85

[Text] Washington 3 December TASS -- The U.S. Department of Defence announced that in the framework of the work for the implementation of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" of President Reagan, it granted to the "McDonnell Douglas Astronautics" company a contract for the development, creation and testing of the new type of space arms, a missile interceptor. These are ground-launched missiles with non-nuclear charges meant for hitting warheads of ballistic missiles in the upper sections of the atmosphere at the altitude of up to 90 kilometers. The ASSOCIATED PRESS reports that the value of the new programme might surpass 400 million dollars.

Self-interest Prevails

LD041831 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 4 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow 4 November TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasilii Kharkov writes:

Elements of space strike systems as part of a single offensive complex are being developed in the USA. Besides the Pentagon, other U.S. departments join in the implementation of the programme of "star wars." For instance, the U.S. Department of Energy, which is in charge of some secret military projects is speeding up the development of a space-based nuclear reactor. That reactor is being assigned the role of the main source of energy space strike arms created in the framework of the implementation of the President's "strategic defence initiative."

Reporting this, the AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY journal close to the military circles writes that the Department of Energy jointly with the Pentagon is looking for a suitable contractor to build the prototype of such a reactor.

A major war industry corporation "McDonnell Douglas Astronautics" has been involved in the material preparation for "star wars." It has secured an order to the development, creation and testing of a new space missile interceptor.

Large U.S. concerns regard the SDI as a boon. The electronic industry association of the USA considering the possibilities of the implementation of the programme of "star wars" recently estimated that the expenditures for that programme might reach nearly 70 billion dollars by the early nineties.

According to U.S. information, in the past two years, over 85 percent out of the 1,400 million dollars meant for the payments on the contracts fulfilled in the framework of the SDI programme went to ten major military contractors, with "Boeing" topping the list and being followed by "Lockheed" and the same "McDonnell Douglas". It is characteristic that the same concerns mainly act as contractors under the Pentagon's contracts for the construction of MX intercontinental missiles, B-1 bombers, cruise missiles.

The SDI has not created a new military-industrial complex. It went to the old one, notes the British NEW STATESMAN magazine. According to the magazine's estimate, some 95 contracts for the creation of space strike systems have been placed in five U.S. states, the biggest number of them going to California.

At the USSR-U.S. Geneva summit it was clearly stated to the U.S. side that a radical reduction in nuclear arms is impossible without closing firmly the door through which weapons could reach outer space. But groundless illusions to get military superiority through the SDI, self-seeking calculations of the military-industrial complex evidently prevail over common sense in Washington.

'Speeding Up' Space-Based Reactor

LD041443 Moscow TASS in English 0852 GMT 4 Dec 85

[Text] New York 4 December TASS -- The U.S. Department of Energy, which has a number of secret military programmes under its authority, is speeding up the development of a space-based nuclear reactor which is assigned the role of the main source of power for space strike weapons being created by WASHINGTON within the framework of the "star wars" programme. AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY journal which is close to military circles reports that the department is planning to choose a contractor soon for the designing and construction of a prototype of such nuclear reactor. The programme the cost of which is estimated at 300 million dollars is being implemented by the department jointly with the Pentagon and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and is to be completed by the year 1991.

Undersecretary Ikle Cited

LD040952 Moscow TASS in English 0841 GMT 4 Dec 85

[Text] Washington 4 December TASS -- The Reagan administration does not intend to curtail the "star wars" program. This was again stated on Tuesday by Fred Ikle, U.S. under-secretary of defence. Speaking at a seminar held here by the conservative American Defence Institute which advocates the pursuance of a position-of-strength policy, he maintained that the implementation of the plan to create a large-scale anti-missile system with space-based

elements would ostensibly make the world more secure. However, as was shown by his further pronouncements, the goals of the U.S. Administration will be diametrically opposite. Kke did not conceal, in particular, that the United States intends to continue to build up its strategic offensive forces.

/12929

CS0: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COMMENT ON FRG DEBATE OVER SDI PARTICIPATION

'Camouflaging U.S. Intentions'

LD060059 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 5 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 5 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Volker Ruehe, deputy head of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] group in Bundestag, is strongly advocating West Germany's participation in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) program, i.e. in "star wars".

Speaking last Wednesday in Bonn at a session of the Konrad Adenauer fund for political education, Ruehe insisted that West Germany's participation in the militarization of space was "politically necessary" and "was in line with the interests of the consolidation of the security of the West". In his opinion, the SDI is the best way to achieve it.

The impression is that West German advocates of "star wars" have just returned to the earth from some far-away planet and have heard nothing about the results of the November Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. Without thinking twice, the "star warriors" from CDU/CSU repeat word for word the American arguments in favour of the SDI in order to camouflage the U.S.A.'s intention to extend the arms race into outer space and to secure for itself military superiority over the USSR. This stand undoubtedly runs counter to the efforts exerted in Geneva in search for mutually acceptable solutions on radical reductions of nuclear armaments on condition that the development of space strike weapons be banned. The matter at issue is prevention of the militarization of space and reductions of nuclear weapons, in their inter-relationship, and this problem is the central one in the sphere of security.

When justifying the U.S. "star wars" program, CDU/CSU politicians and other advocates of the use of space for military purposes continually refer to some imperative needs of "Western security". However, the East is no less interested in its own security than the West. So, it is quite natural that the starting point should be the equality of the sides and equal security for them. This is exactly the stand of the Soviet Union. The overriding idea of its position at the Geneva meeting and its foreign policy in general is that in a nuclear age there is no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, nor can there be any.

Analyzing in detail the SDI program, the West German magazine "DER SPIEGEL" stressed that it is the brainchild of the U.S. military industrial complex, that it is geared to meeting the needs of the Pentagon. The magazine recalls that in many American universities scientists refuse to take part in the development of space weapons and that thousands of them have already included their names in the lists of those who protest against the SDI. A broad campaign of protests against the "star wars" program has been launched in West Germany as well.

Naturally, the drawing of West Germany into the implementation of the U.S. military-space plan would invariably make it an accomplice in the creation of a new class of weapons intended to ensure for the U.S. a possibility to deliver the first nuclear strike from behind a space "shield". This is the true purpose of the "star wars" program, which is absolutely incompatible with the interests of the security of peoples. And it is obvious that those who advocate such wars doom the world to an irreversible nuclear and space confrontation and want to reduce to naught the meaning of the Geneva meeting.

Weinberger's Visit to FRG

LD051855 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian: 1600 GMT 5 Dec 85

[Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger arrived in Bonn today. The officially announced aim of the Pentagon chief's arrival is to participate in the traditional roundtable discussion organized by the Christian Democratic Foundation for political education. However, the real reasons for the current visit to the FRG by the head of the U.S. military agency have nothing in common with political study. It is a matter not at all of theoretical, but of quite practical plans for even closer involvement of West Europe in U.S. military programs, first and foremost in the production of space weapons. These plans were discussed at the NATO Military Planning Committee session that has just been held in Brussels. It became clear that the governments of a number of countries, for example, Greece, Denmark and Netherlands, are very wary of any kind of plans for further stockpiling of weapons, especially after the Geneva meeting which, it would seem, opened up a path toward positive changes in the political climate in the world.

However, by all accounts, Bonn takes up a different position on these questions. It is declaring readiness to join in the American "star wars" plans. What is more, Bonn is even the initiator of the creation of some kind of West European variant of Washington's strategic initiative.

Incidentally, the latest issue of the Hamburg journal SPIEGEL quotes notable facts about who in the FRG is behind all this activity -- major firms in the FRG, above all the Bavarian aviation firm Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm. It has already received an advance of FM25 million for the development of laser weapons. And now they say that several hundreds of millions will be needed for serial production. It is for these enormous profits that the "star wars" plans are being speeded up.

Meanwhile, quite a few voices warning about the dangers connected with this are being heard in the FRG. The Social Democratic group has submitted a bill in parliament calling for refusal to support the U.S. military space programs. Bundestag deputies

who are in our country on an official visit to our country also spoke to me about this. During the conversation between Andrey Gromyko and the FRG parliamentarians a principled assessment was made of the U.S. "star wars" program as incompatible with the interests of other states' security. Involvement by the FRG in this program would make it an accomplice in the creation of a new class of weapons with all the consequences deriving from this. One would wish to hope that Bonn will assess the situation which has arisen and adopt a position corresponding to the interests of peace.

FRG Bundestag Discussion

LD100048 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, December 9 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov reporting. The idea that the realization of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative will destabilize the situation in the world and undermine efforts to curb the arms race has become the dominant and recurrent theme in the speeches delivered in the West German Bundestag which began two-day public hearings on the issue of West Germany's participation in the realization of the American "star wars" plans. The hearings started here today. The speakers who appeared before the Bundestag Commissions on Foreign Affairs and defense included scientists, members of the general public and of the business community.

The speakers stressed that the SDI program in actual fact was not a defensive, but an offensive one and that its realization would breach the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missiles systems, start a new round of the arms race both in space and on earth. Many speakers voiced extreme concern over the possible dangerous consequences of West Germany's participation in carrying out "star wars" plans. For instance, Professor H. Fischer from Bochum stressed that the participation of West Germany and other European NATO countries in the SDI would constitute the violation of the article of the Soviet-American ABM Treaty which prohibited the parties to it to transfer ABM technology to third countries. Social scientist G. Brauch described the SDI program as "unrealistic" and said it was not to be trusted. G. Duerr, a physicist from Munich, evaluated the SDI program as "utopia".

Congressional Findings Published

LD051835 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 5 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, December 5 TASS -- A collection of documents and materials on hearings held at a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs last spring into implications of President Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative and U.S. policy in the field of anti-satellite weapons has been published at U.S. congress.

Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Dante B. Fascell, in a statement on the occasion, stressed the importance of the conclusion drawn during the hearings that the ABM Treaty serves as a foundation in the efforts to prevent an arms race in defensive systems and a buildup of offensive strategic weapons. However, the committee chairman pointed out, attempts are being made in the United States to weaken the accord with a view to implementing the "star wars" programme.

The hearings revealed the Pentagon's intention to circumvent the treaty-stipulated ban on the testing of ABM system components by alleging that SDI provides only for the

testing of subcomponents of such a system. Such attempts against the letter and spirit of the ABM Treaty do not help preserve the agreement, but, on the contrary, undermine it.

Fascell stressed that 33 billion dollars are planned to be spent in the next six years on SDI research alone, while the deployment of the system is estimated at trillions of dollars.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NATO DEPUTY CHIEF SEES SDI ENDANGERING 'FLEXIBLE RESPONSE'

Bonn GENERAL ANZEIGER in German 22 Oct 85 p 2

[Article by Ekkehard Kohrs: "SDI, Moral Condemnation of the Current Strategy?; Skepticism Developing Among High German NATO Officers on the Topic of Space Defense"]

[Text] Mons--While politicians of all parties in Bonn comment almost daily hastily or guardedly, enthusiastically or negatively on the U.S. SDI, the pros and cons of a skeleton agreement with the United States run right through the middle of the coalition, Chancellor Kohl, starting tomorrow, discusses the problems in Washington, and there is much talk about EVI (European Defense Initiative) and ABM, the experts who conceivably will have to deal some day with the military consequences of the space project are surprisingly restrained. In the absence of concrete clues, a military assessment of the situation is not yet possible at this time. But among high German NATO officers skepticism is noticeable when SDI is the topic.

The much discussed question whether the United States is well on its way, for example, towards breaking the ABM treaty, which prohibits development, testing and installation of missile defense systems is not one of the priority questions at NATO headquarters in Mons near Brussels. Although this topic is discussed just as the conceivable SDI supplement for defense against cruise missiles and short-range missiles as part of a European Defense Initiative (EVI), the military assessment of the German NATO leadership starts out without change from the traditional, from the actual condition.

It is called "flexible response" and is the unchanged current NATO strategy based on the three types of reaction, of direct defense, premeditated escalation and nuclear reaction based on conventional armed forces, nuclear medium and short-range weapons as well as nuclear-strategic missiles of the United States. This strategy of flexible reaction--in that respect Deputy NATO Supreme Commander Hans-Joachim Mack leaves no doubt in conversation--will undoubtedly exist until the turn of the century.

Since April of last year, the four-star general is in Mons successor to Gen Guenter Kiessling and, according to his own statement, in contrast to his predecessor has no problems with General Rogers, the NATO supreme commander. Also in the entourage of Bonn's permanent representative with NATO the validity of the

present deterrence is pointed out. Irrespective of SDI research and possible military applications, therefore strengthening of the conventional armed forces is said to be necessary, which within the framework of the forward defense and in view of the allied ratio of forces always signifies strengthening of the army of the Bundeswehr.

The moral postulate of President Ronald Reagan of preventing wars in the future owing to SDI by means other than the destruction of the attacker on the ground and a drawing-away from nuclear weapons connected therewith could, the NATO officers fear, lead to moral condemnation of the current strategy, which is based without change on nuclear deterrence as a mainstay. General Mack perceives the danger that thus the credibility of the flexible response could be undermined. This would be dangerous for the fact alone that as yet nobody can say the kind of "fantastic defense system" that will exist perhaps 20 years hence.

In the opinion of the highest German NATO soldier, SDI, which wants to defend with the latest nonnuclear technology such as laser-beam, particle and microwave weapons against Soviet ballistic missiles in space, must not lead to a "divided risk" in the Western alliance. Mack: "We must always keep the strategic unity of the area as focal point."

The immense sums of money which SDI consumes also encounter skepticism. Here the Rogers deputy points out the necessary improvement of the conventional defense which must not be permitted to suffer under SDI's consumption of billions. This includes elimination of logistic gaps. Thus the demanded stockpiling of ammunition for 30 days has not yet been achieved. A principal worry in the alliance remain the consequences of the sudden drop in the birthrate. The extension of the German compulsory military service was recorded with a sense of relief in Brussels.

General Mack also wants to see attention paid to the question of a tactical defensive system against medium and short-range missiles as well as cruise missiles, because Europe is not threatened by the Soviet long-range systems. Here, too, he does not want to expose himself too much. In Mons the sentence is often heard that no detailed contributions can as yet be made to the discussion because it is simply unknown what will come of SDI. However, the military are opposed to self-exclusion from the SDI program from the start. But no enthusiasm is perceived. Different from some politicians, soldiers simply hold on to what they have.

12356

CSO: 5200/2564

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG'S GENSCHER FAVORS DISCUSSING SDI AT NATO MEETING

LD121239 Hamburg DPA in German 1130 GMT 12 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, 12 Dec (DPA) -- Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal foreign minister, has declared that he favors discussing the consequences of the U.S. research program for a space-based missile defense system at the conference of NATO foreign ministers in Brussels. In an interview with the Southwest German Radio today, Genscher said that a discussion must begin within NATO on what possible effects SDI can have on the cohesion of the alliance, on the security of the Europeans, and on the strategic stability between West and East. There were still many open questions, chances as well as risks, and the most careful evaluations were necessary to preserve the strategy of preventing war at all costs. No development should be allowed to occur by which a war, nuclear or conventional, could be possible again, rather, the prevention of war must remain the common aim.

In connection with the Federal Government's SDI decision, which is due next week, Genscher affirmed that there could be no talk of state participation by the Federal Government in the program. This was a question of an American program on the basis of an American decision. All that was to be decided in Bonn was the open question as to whether the available conditions relating to the transfer of technology and the protection of patents and secrets were sufficient to secure appropriate conditions for participation of German firms.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2579

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG'S DIE WELT SAYS GOVERNMENT FAVORS SDI PARTICIPATION

DIE WELT Article

DW091200 Bonn DIE WELT in German 9 Dec 85 p 1

[Report by "MS/DW": "SDI Agreement in Spring: Chancellor Kohl Paves the Way"]

[Excerpts] Bonn -- In its 18 December session the federal cabinet will decide on German participation in the U.S. SDI research program. According to DIE WELT's information, a government delegation, which is expected to be headed by an Economics Ministry official, will work out the details with the U.S. Government in the interest of German firms, so that an agreement will be completed in the spring of 1986 at the latest.

Yesterday, it was said in the chancellery that there is no question that the cabinet will follow Chancellor Kohl's recommendation and formally decide on German participation in SDI. The chancellor has paved the way through his statement that he considers the research program politically necessary and morally justified.

Decision Expected 'Next Week'

DW100855 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 1900 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Text] The benefits of German participation in the U.S. SDI project were discussed during a hearing in Bonn today of experts by parliamentary committees. Opinions were divided. Many experts advocated the view that implementation of U.S. weapons plans for space will not produce any additional protection for Europeans. Others emphasized, in contrast, that participation is indispensable, if only to stay abreast of technological progress.

Quarters in Bonn said today that the Federal Government probably will decide in the middle of next week on opening negotiations with the United States on German cooperation in the SDI program.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2579

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG'S RUEHE STATEMENT ON SDI LEADS TO 'PARTY CLASHES'

Report on Ruehe Statement

LD080845 Hamburg DPA in German 0805 GMT 8 Dec 85

[Excerpt] Hamburg, 8 Dec (DPA) -- The deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, Volker Ruehe, has announced that there will be an exchange of letters between the governments in Bonn and Washington in the spring of 1986 regulating German participation in American plans for space-based missile defence (SDI).

In an interview with the Cologne's EXPRESS (Monday edition), Ruehe said that by spring all the questions, such as price regulation and the utilization and exchange of information on technology, would be clarified. The fundamental decision by the Bonn coalition of the CDU/CSU and the FDP had in any case been made long ago. The SDI research program was justified and politically necessary.

CDU Deputies Comment

LD090953 Hamburg DPA in German 0925 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Excerpt] Bonn, 9 Dec (DPA) -- According to CDU deputies the FRG has not yet made a decision on starting negotiations with the United States on the FRG's participation in the SDI project for a space-based missile defense system. This was said by CDU Deputy Hans Stercken, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, after Volker Ruehe, deputy chairman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, said over the weekend that the fundamental decision had been made long ago. He expected a written agreement between the FRG and the United States in the spring.

The Ruehe statement led to party clashes at the start of a 2-day public hearing on SDI by 14 experts before the Foreign Affairs and Defense Committees. While CDU disarmament expert Juergen Todenhoefer and Stercken denied that the FRG had committed itself on this issue, SPD committee members accused the FRG of having decided in favor of U.S. negotiations in disregard of the hearing.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2579

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG TELEVISION COMMENTATOR ON BONN'S SDI DECISION

DW121101 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2100 GMT 11 Dec 85

[Commentary by Guenther von Lojewski]

[Excerpts] The Federal Government has taken a lot of time with its opinion-forming process on SDI -- too much time. By the time it decided to polish up the program's contents somewhat it was almost too late. The consequence is turbulence in the alliance. Just prior to the decision in Bonn, U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, President Reagan himself, and Secretary of State Shultz were forced to do some fast talking. Now the Federal Government can approve the opening of government negotiations. The upshot will be an agreement by which the government will safeguard the interests of German industry.

The problems have not arisen from technology. An industrial country such as the Federal Republic, having no natural resources, cannot disengage itself from technological development without suffering lasting consequences. German industry is veritably salivating for the pool of dollars called SDI.

What I believe caused confusion in Europe was the military-strategic scheme outlined by Washington. The United States allowed the impression to arise that Washington had first deployed its modern nuclear weapons, the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe, and is only now seeking to protect its own continent against attack by means of SDI, as though NATO were heading for a two-class alliance.

It is true that Western Europe could not be defended through "star wars." It was for that reason that European program was developed here, Eureka. That is why Foreign Minister Genscher occasionally sought to play the Chinese card. Yet Genscher ultimately returned to coalition discipline. NATO remains a defensive alliance, and SDI will be given a European component. Politically the Federal Republic, especially the Federal Republic, has no alternative anyway.

/9274
CSO: 5200/2579

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

DUMAS ARGUES AGAINST SDI AT WEU MEETING

PM111515 Paris LE FIGARO in French 5 Dec 85 p 9

[Report by Pierre Darcourt: "Western European Union and Europe's Defense: The French Reservations"]

[Text] Under its glass roof, and with its polished paneling, and red velvet-covered tiers, the semi-circular room in which the West European Union [WEU] parliamentarians and council representatives were meeting was the scene of a fierce debate yesterday.

The main speech was delivered by French External Relations Minister Roland Dumas who once again strongly condemned the way in which the discussion on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] had been launched. According to him it is likely to cause fragmentation among the Europeans. It therefore seems that the French Government's position remains unchanged. The diversity of the strategic situations of the different European countries faced with this initiative and the awareness of the technological and industrial stakes were once again the two key arguments put forward by the minister to justify the categorical rejection of SDI.

Obviously, aside from this formulation, Europe's geographical position does not lend itself to a system of protection designed to intercept missiles at high altitudes and long distances. France fears that the technological and industrial competition which is starting will lead to a European "brain drain" and that the United States might not accept us as partners but regard us merely as subcontractors.

Roland Dumas partly dispelled the ambiguity surrounding the Eureka project, hitherto presented as the "civilian" counterproposal to the SDI. Indeed the French external relations minister stressed that the French proposals on Eureka and in the sphere of military aeronautics could be the start of a real mobilization of the Europeans in the sphere of major military technologies.

Should we include in this assertion: the sixth generation of optical computers (with regard to which we will really be able to talk of artificial intelligence); highly accurate infrared detection systems; battle management systems based on surveillance, reconnaissance, early warning, communication, and electronic warfare satellites [as published]. If that was the case it would be a decisive step toward a really coherent European defense system.

But behind the vague generalities, Roland Dumas nonetheless clearly set the limits of this enterprise, because the rejection of all supranationality was clearly reiterated.

A study of the whole speech shows that the minister is saying conflicting things. "We are convinced," he said in particular, "that consultation (among European countries) on security matters, should not have the aim or the unintentional effect of calling into question the conditions and frameworks in which the defense of our countries now operate." In short, European cooperation on armaments -- yes, European cooperation on defense -- perhaps, European defense system -- certainly not.

It was a speech which gave a curt reply to the opening speech by Jean-Marie Caro, chairman of the WEU Parliamentary Assembly, who made a forceful appeal for the dynamic and practical revival of a common defense policy for the seven member countries, with clear objectives, a definite program, and a united desire to take decisions each time that Europe has to give its verdict and make its voice heard to protect its interests and ensure its survival.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2578

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRENCH RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY MINISTER CURIEN ON EUREKA

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 23 Oct 85 p 7

[Article by Wubbo Tempel: "Pragmatic Coalition of Industry and Government"]

[Text] "We have seen a true pro-Eureka movement come to life," says French Minister of Science and Technology Hubert Curien contentedly. Since April, when the French plan for European technology was launched, he has traveled to the capitals of 18 countries, among them the countries Finland and Turkey. Tomorrow he will visit with his Dutch colleagues minister for economic affairs, Van Aardenne and Minister of Education and Science, Deetman in the Hague, who together are in charge of the Dutch technology policy.

We are interviewing the Minister in his Ministry building in Paris. On almost every wall there are pictures and plaques hanging commemorating successful Ariane-missile flights. The modern art on the wall also is not abstract, the outlines of missiles and airplanes are clearly recognizable in the paintings. Curien himself has had a lot to do with the Arian program: from 1976 until 1984, when he became a minister, he was president of the National Center for Space Exploration. Curien (60) admits that a number of unclear points still exist about the Eureka plan.

But he himself has a clear-cut idea, i.e., the pragmatic cooperation of industries, subsidized by their governments, for each technological project there should be an ad hoc agreement, no central guide-lines, no central treasure. Government funding is really necessary. Curien has high hopes, that other Eureka countries will also see it this way.

Government funding

Curien: "I am against a joint Eureka fund. A government is much more motivated to participate financially in the projects it is interested in. For example, a project in which Dutch, German and French companies participate, would be funded by the governments of those three countries."

Question: Is government funding necessary? British Prime Minister Thatcher is against that.

Answer: "Of course governments must contribute. The programs mean important developments and carry a certain risk for the companies involved. I do not want to define the amount of funding I don't have a magic figure, but an average portion in the neighborhood of 50 percent seems reasonable to me. On the average. For those projects which result in the immediate marketing of concrete products, the customers could pay more, of course."

Question: France itself has allocated 1 billion French francs for Eureka for the year 1986. Critics say that this not "new" funding, but that these are simply old, existing funds that are being re-allocated for a different purpose.

Answer: "That is an interesting point. You can ask that question about Eureka, but the same question would apply to SDI." (The Minister himself starts speaking about the American Strategic Defense Initiative, although the French side has always officially denied that the launching of Eureka in April was a direct answer to SDI). "Sometimes it is believed that the funding allocated for SDI is entirely new funding. That is not true. On the contrary: if it is true that our funding comes from an existing well-known funding program, then these are funds which had already been designated for research. And, from whichever angle you look at it, the budget for research and development in France rose last year by many billions of French francs. (In real costs the budget rose by 4 percent to 42 billion French francs). Let's look upon Eureka's one billion as one of those 42 billions. You may find that to be weak reasoning. But without Eureka I would have been less able to plead for that increase."

Eureka has been civilian, non-military, in nature from the start. Curien explains: "We want to federate the whole of Europe with the plan. Because of the position taken by some countries, we didn't want problems beforehand. Sweden and Switzerland, for example, would not have joined if military projects had been included."

Question: But isn't it strange to leave the arms industry out of it? SDI specifically assists the arms industry.

Answer: The Minister smiles and points out that the French arms industry does profit in this manner: "Ah-ah. In our country there is no industry that is exclusively military in nature. Who are the ones that are working for the French army? Industries like Matra, Aerospatiale, Dassault. But Aerospatiale also manufactures Airbus airplanes, and Matra manufactures cars and computers. Eureka is going to be the opposite of SDI, which has a military program, with possible spin-offs for non-military uses. Here in this country the projects are non-military. But it is conceivable that there will be a certain military spin-off for the industries, those high-tech industries and also for the arms industry."

And further: "I don't mean to say that France is not contemplating the opening of joint military programs, independent of the Eureka project."

Question: There is a fear at times of French dominance or the dominance of French industry.

Answer: "It is our sincere wish to make it Eureka a European affair. Because we have taken the initiative, it is sometimes thought that we want to be the bosses, the satraps, of this program. That isn't true. We don't want to make it a franco-french adventure nor a franco-german one, something about which we are also being reproached at times."

Curien is willing to make large concessions in order to secure Dutch participation: "I can see that it is a problem for a country like the Netherlands, where comparatively speaking there are a number of very large industries. I am thinking of Philips, Unilever, Shell. In a Eureka project in which Philips participates, the Philips part would have to be funded by the Dutch government."

"If that should be too heavy a burden for the Dutch government, others could contribute. We, for example. A part of the Philips activities could then, for example, be manufactured by the Philips laboratories in France--or in Germany. Of course, this is something we still have to decide on. But I would not like that to become an obstacle beforehand. Because it needn't be that."

Question: So there are no French nationalistic motives present?

Answer: "Oh, yes. Definitely. The national interest of France is that in ten or twelve years a joint European economy will come into being. We are sure, that if European countries try to stimulate their economic development independently of each other, they will fail. The national interest of France is a strong France in a strong Europe. Because a strong France in a weak Europe--is not possible. And neither is a strong Germany, or a strong Holland. We need each other's markets and funds."

Question: Has the French attitude, as far as this is concerned, changed?

Answer: "Certainly."

Question: Why?

Answer: "Face the facts. Presently there is an excellent government in France, ha ha."

Question: Would it not be easier to work together with American or Japanese industries?

Conqueror

Answer: "That is a difficult issue. It isn't good politics to be strongly negative a priori. We will have to study it case by case. But to go for real cooperation, that is, indeed, somewhat dangerous. We see large Japanese firms invading our continent. We want to react to that invasion. If we do that jointly with the conqueror, our force de frappe would certainly be somewhat weakened. American and Japanese interests are very clear. European interests are starting to become clearer now too. But let us first of all give European interests a chance to manifest themselves."

Question: What do you expect to come out of Hannover, where the next Eureka conference will be held on 5 and 6 November?

Answer: "A number of issues will become clear there. The fact that we arranged a date and a place has first of all accelerated the processes. But the conference will also be fruitful. I expect promises of financial participation in the program by several countries. As far as that is concerned, I am on the same wavelength with my colleagues from Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Italy. But I can not yet fully assess how my colleagues will react."

"Furthermore, I expect that we can announce a half to one dozen projects. In any case, I know that to be so from what is going on here in France. Six of them projects are completely finished, and another six are nearing completion. I am not including the initiatives in which France is not participating."

"Finally we will discuss the organization of the program. We want to make Eureka an issue of interest to industrialists, and therefore, I want to defend it from the beginning against any form of structured organization. It should not become a kind of rain, which the governments allow to fall down on the industry."

13092/12948

CSO: 3698/96

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN SDI THROUGH NORAD CONSIDERED

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 7 Nov 85 p A8

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

OTTAWA

The United States is again seeking Canadian co-operation in Star Wars ballistic missile defence programs.

The Pentagon wants Canadian military strategists to participate in long-range contingency planning for ballistic missile defences. The planning would be carried out through the existing Canadian-U.S. North American Aerospace Defence Command.

Canadian military sources expect a decision could be made by Ottawa within six months. They said they are trying to gather more information about the full scope of the invitation so that Cabinet ministers can decide on what is acknowledged as a politically sensitive question.

The NORAD agreement expires next year. A proposed five-year renewal is under negotiation by Ottawa and Washington, and the issue is being studied by a House of Commons committee.

NORAD was established in the fifties to counter Soviet bomber threats. Canadian officials have tried to divorce the issue of NORAD renewal from the controversial question of possible Canadian participation in Star Wars ballistic missile defences.

But the effort to separate Star Wars from NORAD issues is made more difficult because the invitation to participate in ballistic missile defence planning comes through NORAD.

The invitation comes even though the Mulroney Government said in September it is not interested in participating on a government-to-government basis in Star Wars research. Ottawa said, however, that private high-technology Canadian companies were free to bid on contracts.

Washington intends to spend \$26 billion during the next five years to study the feasibility of systems to defend North America against a Soviet ballistic missile attack.

The research effort, officially known as the Strategic Defence Initiative, is also called Star Wars because some of the proposed systems could be based in space and could involve exotic technologies such as X-ray laser beams to shoot down incoming ballistic missiles.

The NORAD planning exercise for ballistic missile defence is the second phase of a project called Strategic Defence Architecture 2000, or SDA 2000.

Canadian officers took part in the first phase, which involved an updating of the master plan to defend North America from a possible Soviet bomber attack and led to the Canadian-U.S. agreement last March to build a new north warning radar system in the Arctic.

"SDA 2000 Phase II, in which continued Canadian participation has been requested by CINCNORAD (the Commander in Chief of NORAD, U.S. Air Force General Robert Herres) will refine the air-defence planning of Phase I and develop and integrate analogous planning for future space and ballistic missile defences," according to a background document prepared by Colonel W. C. Weston, a strategic policy analyst at National Defence Headquarters in Ottawa.

The U.S. invitation last spring to participate in Star Wars research stirred controversy in Canada and prompted a summer-long series of parliamentary hearings in which peace groups said that Star Wars would escalate the arms race and undermine nuclear deterrence.

In September, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said Canada's own research priorities preclude governmental participation in Star Wars research. He has refused to say, however, whether the Government believes ballistic missile defences undermine deterrence.

Unlike the SDI research invitation, the new U.S. invitation to participate in military planning has been made quietly and has gone largely unnoticed on Parliament Hill.

Col. Weston said the United States will go ahead with SDA 2000 planning whether or not Canada participates in the exercise.

The second phase of SDA 2000 will try to make contingency plans for the kinds of ballistic missile threats North America might face well into the next century. This is "conceptual planning" and it does not commit either Canada or the United States to actual deployment of ballistic missile defences if the SDI research proves the feasibility of the systems, Col. Weston said in an interview.

"All of this is subject to political decisions" by the Canadian and U.S. cabinets, he said.

The potential implications of the SDA 2000 plan are so great that it is probably wise for Canadian officers to participate, according to Lawrence Hagen, research director of the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, a private think tank.

It should be made clear to the United States, however, that participation in SDA 2000 does not mean Canadian blanket endorsement of ballistic missile defences.

/9317

CSO: 5220/20

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CANADIAN DEFENSE MINISTER NIELSEN DENIES NORAD, SDI LINK

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 19 Nov 85 p A4

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

OTTAWA

Defence Minister Erik Nielsen said yesterday that the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative and the renewal of the North American Aerospace Defence (NORAD) agreement are "quite distinct" questions.

However, Liberal defence critic Leonard Hopkins said Mr. Nielsen is "stonewalling" and refusing to say directly whether NORAD will be used as a way to get Canada involved in SDI, also known as Star Wars.

In the Commons, Mr. Hopkins asked Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to give assurances that the NORAD renewal, expected early next year, will not be used to enter "into a hidden Canadian-American effort of co-operation in the Strategic Defence Initiative."

Ottawa rejected joining SDI research on a government-to-government basis two months ago, but said private companies could bid on research contracts.

Mr. Mulroney, who has been reluctant to reply when asked similar questions in the past, left it to Mr. Nielsen to answer. Mr. Nielsen said Mr. Hopkins should "know better than to ask that question ... (because) the two questions are quite distinct."

In fact, the U.S. Air Force general who commands NORAD has asked the Canadian Forces to provide officers to assist in a project known as Strategic Defence Architecture 2000. The SDA 2000 project is to make contingency plans for an anti-ballistic missile defence of North America if the SDI technology is proven workable and Washington decides to deploy it.

SDI is the research part of President Ronald Reagan's vision of an anti-ballistic missile defence for North America.

Mr. Hopkins said the Liberals want to have a clause inserted in the NORAD renewal agreement stating that the joint Canadian-U.S. command is not to be part of an anti-ballistic missile system. NORAD was originally established to defend North America from Soviet bombers, not ballistic missiles.

There is a debate raging among scientists, military strategists and arms control experts about whether ballistic missile defences, such as SDI, would undermine or enhance nuclear deterrence. The Soviets oppose SDI.

The SDI issue undoubtedly will be raised by the Soviets today and tomorrow during the summit meeting in Geneva between Mr. Reagan and Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev.

/9317

CSO: 5220/20

CANADIAN SCIENTISTS FEDERATION OFFICIAL ON ROLE IN SDI

Toronto THE SUNDAY STAR in English 10 Nov 85 pp H1, H2

[Article by John Honderich]

[Text]

Could Canada end up an integral part of Star Wars?

The answer, it seems, is a definite "yes".

At least that's the view of John Pike, associate director of space policy for the Federation of American Scientists. He has been keeping a keen if critical eye on the U.S. space defence program.

The federation, which counts 24 Nobel Prize winners among its members, has been providing the most authoritative and independent analysis of President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defence Initiative.

"From what we've seen so far, Canada would be the perfect staging point for several aspects of the program," Pike recently told the first conference of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. "And, when you look at the geography, it's not hard to figure out why."

All this assumes, of course, that Canada agrees to be part of Star Wars and that the technology jumps from the drawing board into reality — both big "ifs".

But by Pike's count there are at least five components of Star Wars that might be deployed in Canada. "Might" is the key word for the technology is still in a developing stage and could change on further research.

Defence umbrella

However, tucked away among such codenames as "Braduskill", "Excalibur", "SATKA Project 0008" and "ERIS" (Exo-atmospheric re-entry-vehicle interception system) are the five projects that Pike argues are meant for the true north strong and free.

Ranging from a souped-up AWACs-type super spy plane to a missile that would intercept Soviet missiles in outer space, fly alongside them and then fire explosive warheads at them, the five would be part of the multi-layered defence umbrella envisaged under Star Wars.

Basically the Strategic Defence Initiative in its present form breaks down into four phases. It provides for the surveillance, tracking and eventual destruction of all Soviet missiles at various phases of their flight path:

□ The boost phase (the first stage lasting several minutes when the missiles are launched into space by booster rockers);

□ The post-boost phase (the second stage lasting several more minutes when the missiles fly free of their boosters to achieve the required altitude);

□ The mid-course phase (the third and longest stage in which

the missiles and their warheads fly in outer space towards their targets, which can take up to 25 minutes); and

□ The terminal phase (the fourth and final stage in which the missiles re-enter the atmosphere and strike their targets, which can take several more minutes.)

Prime route

If the overall plan works, sensors based on ground, in planes and in space would be required to pick up all incoming missiles. These sensors would have to work faultlessly, sifting through tens of thousands of decoys and billions of bits of chaff and debris to pick out the thousands of warheads the Soviets are capable of sending.

Once detected, it would be left to newly-developed lasers, rockets and particle beam weapons to intercept and destroy these warheads.

As its name suggests, most of Star Wars would be deployed in space. Much of the rest would be in the continental United States. But, particularly for the late-mid-course and terminal phases, the defence systems should ideally be situated on land near the areas to be defended. And, that's where Canada fits in.

Plunked right between the superpowers, Canadian space and air provides the prime route for incoming Soviet missiles.

"The whole concept is in a state of rapid flux," Pike says. "Thus it is probably too early to draw any firm conclusions about Canada's role. All I can provide is a snapshot."

But even Pike's snapshot provides a fascinating foreshadowing of how Canada could get involved.

Here's a rundown of the projects already under way that might be deployed in Canada.

□ **SATKA project 0008 — the Airborne Optical system.**

Using some of the technology already in place on the super spy AWACs planes, this project calls for the use of a modified Boeing 767 jetliner.

Incoming warheads

It would be equipped with two giant "sensor telescopes" capable of picking up and identifying warheads within a radius of 750 kilometers (460 miles). The telescopes would be equipped with infrared sensors that would be invulnerable to radar jamming.

Under current plans, between 20 and 40 of these jets would be deployed out of a dozen or so patrol bases.

They would fly at an altitude of between 15 and 25 kilometers (9 and 15 miles) and pick up incoming warheads in the final part of their flight. Right now these jets could fly for 12 hours at a stretch under human control. But plans are under way for a remote-controlled jet that could stay up for several days at a time.

The system has already been under study for several years and the first test flight is set for 1988.

"For optimum tracking of Soviet ICBMs, (these jets) would probably fly over Canadian airspace," Pike says. "Some would be patrolling Canada and some would be on their way to the Arctic Ocean."

Since Canada lies directly between the superpowers, Pike argues it only makes sense that these jets be based in Canada's far north "in order to provide for an earlier warning".

□ **SATKA Project 0009 — Terminal Imaging Radar.**

This ground-based radar system, known as TIR, would pick up the information gathered by the Boeing 767s and refine it even more.

One of the greatest obstacles Star Wars must overcome is the countless decoys the Soviets are bound to send to confuse the American defence sensors.

Small heater

One decoy already envisaged is an aluminized balloon — similar to current weather balloons and weighing only a few kilograms — that would be attached to incoming missiles. Designed to inflate

on re-entry, these balloons would be made to look like warheads.

With the addition of a small heater, they would also prevent heat-sensitive infra-red sensors from detecting which balloons had warheads and which had none.

Pike says a Soviet attack of 10,000 warheads would in all likelihood be accompanied by anywhere from 85,000 to 175,000 such decoys.

This is where TIR would fit in. Using the basic information provided by the 767s, this ultra-sensitive radar would be left with the job of picking out the decoys.

Using a sophisticated filtering process, it is designed to operate on a frequency and bandwidth that would minimize the effect of a nuclear explosion.

It would be ground-based but some planners are already talking of making it mobile to avoid a pre-emptive attack.

Again, in Pike's view, Canada's far north would provide an ideal location for this radar, which should be demonstrated by the end of the decade.

□ KEW Project 0006 — HEDI (High-altitude endo-atmospheric defence interceptor).

Once TIR figures out which are the real warheads, it would pass the information on to this new rocket known as HEDI.

HEDI is essentially a ground-based rocket designed to protect American — and presumably Canadian — cities as the last line of defence.

Under current plans it is to be a two-stage solid fuel rocket weighing about 7,000 kilograms (15,500 pounds). Each stage would burn for only a few seconds with a total burn time of between 5 and 20 seconds. It is designed to intercept incoming warheads at an altitude of 15 to 50 kilometers (9 to 30 miles).

Pellet shower

Pike explains that a single battery of HEDI would be expected to defend an area of 30,000 square kilometers. That means about 100 batteries would be needed to cover the entire United States.

Needless to say that when it comes to Uncle Sam's northern flank, there is little doubt Canada might be called upon to base some of the interceptors here.

HEDI would probably be guided by infra-red sensors and when it got close to its target, present plans call for it to use a laser to detonate an explosive warhead. That in turn would shower the incoming Soviet warheads with high velocity pellets to knock them out.

Another plan calls for HEDI to explode its own nuclear weapon in order to destroy its Soviet counterpart.

□ KEW Project 0002 (Braduskill or Exo-Atmospheric Non Nuclear Kill Technology).

Like HEDI, Braduskill also calls for a land-based missile system. But instead it would be instructed to hone in on Soviet missiles, fly alongside them for a while and then destroy them with explosive warheads.

The reason for the "fly along" would be to allow the "smart" missile more time to separate the decoys from the real thing.

Braduskill's weapons would be guided to their targets by infra-red sensors or radar sensitive homing devices. Already four contractors in Huntsville, Ala. have been awarded a \$1 million contract to develop the technology.

"If I was the manager of this contract, I would be extremely disappointed if the contractors didn't look at Canada as the most likely base for these weapons," Pike says. "The missiles would have to be deployed as close to the Soviet Union as possible and that limits your base sites considerably."

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CANADIAN GROUP INDICATES SUPPORT FOR SDI

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 8 Nov 85 p A7

[Text]

WASHINGTON (CP) — The Toronto-based National Citizens' Coalition, a conservative interest group, launched a publicity campaign Thursday aimed at showing Americans that many Canadians support U.S. President Ronald Reagan's anti-Soviet military policies.

Coalition leaders Colin Brown and David Somerville also criticized Prime Minister Brian Mulroney for what they say is an ungrateful attitude toward the Reagan administration when thanks are in order for protecting Canada from Soviet Communist domination.

The coalition, which claims membership of 30,000 individuals, has placed more than \$15,000 worth of advertisements in the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times* and the conservative magazine, *National Review*, that says to Reagan and U.S. citizens: "Thank you. Stand fast."

An opinion poll of more than 1,000 Canadian adults prepared by the coalition for a news conference in Washington indicates 40 per cent approve of the strategic defence initiative, 11 per cent disapprove and 14 per cent do not know.

/9317

CSO: 5220/20

CANADA: VISITING SOVIET SCIENTIST WARNS AGAINST SDI

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 19 Oct 85 p A11

[Article by Hugh Winsor]

[Text]

OTTAWA

A senior Soviet scientist warned a gathering of disarmament experts yesterday that the missile defence system being promoted by President Ronald Reagan could prompt a frightening escalation in the super-power arms race.

Oleg Bykov, deputy director of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of World Economy and International Relations, reflected the attitude of the proposal for missile reduction that Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev has placed on the table for next month's meeting with Mr. Reagan in Geneva.

Mr. Bykov's assertion that a shift from deterrence toward an attempt to build a defensive system against intercontinental ballistic missiles would threaten nuclear stability was received favorably by most of the Western speakers at the conference, sponsored by the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security.

Although the Gorbachev proposal contains provision for deep cuts in the number of nuclear warheads and launching systems for both sides, Mr. Bykov stressed that the Soviet insistence on prohibition of space-based weapons is a condition for progress at Geneva.

Alton Frye, Washington director of the Council on Foreign Relations (an independently financed U.S. foreign policy institute) and a consultant to the U.S. Congress, agreed that meaningful negotiations with the Soviets depend on a resolution of the dispute over the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, known as Star Wars.

Shifting the nuclear contest into space would create an irreversible situation in which both superpowers would be locked in a destructive spiral of unprecedented proportions, Mr. Bykov said.

One of the Western participants who agreed with him was keynote speaker Denis Healey, former British defence minister and chancellor of the exchequer. He predicted that the number of nuclear warheads in existence would double by the 1990s unless the superpowers reached some agreement to limit arms.

Until now, the rough balance that has prevailed for the past 40 years has been impervious to relative changes in the numbers of missiles and different systems of delivery, Mr. Healey said. He sees that stability as being threatened.

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TOKYO CORRESPONDENT INTERVIEWED ON SDI

OW170432 Tokyo TOKYO SHIMBUN in Japanese 14 Nov 85 Morning Edition pp 8-9

[By reporter Akira Furumoto]

[Text] A 2-day U.S.-USSR summit is scheduled to open in Geneva, Switzerland, on 19 November. Its most important subject is disarmament, particularly the strategic defense initiative (SDI) which is being pushed by the United States. The SDI is said to have been included in the summit agenda at the insistence of Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev, and this may indicate how serious the Soviet Union is about the SDI. Why does the Soviet Union feel so threatened by the SDI? Public statements by the Soviet Union have not yet provided a clear answer to this question. What is the real intention of the Soviet Union? How does the Soviet Union take rumors about Japanese participation in the SDI? TOKYO SHIMBUN's "This is our Special Report Division" has interviewed Viktor Zatsypin, Tokyo Bureau chief of the Soviet state-run news agency, TASS, to hear his views.

[Furumoto] Why is the Soviet Union so fearful of the U.S. SDI program?

[Zatsypin] It is not at all correct to say that the Soviet Union is just watching with fear while the United States is building its space defense system. The problem is that the SDI threatens not only the Soviet Union but also the whole world.

The U.S. approach to disarmament is this: The United States wants to begin disarmament negotiations only when it attains a military edge over the Soviet Union by producing successive new weapons. But postwar history shows that such an approach is a mistake.

When the United States made an atom bomb, the Soviet Union countered by creating its own atom bomb. The Soviet Union has responded, hydrogen bomb for hydrogen bomb, missile for missile. In this way, the arms race has continued endlessly, has it not?

By the same token, if the United States creates an SDI system, we will have to develop countervailing weapons in order to defend our country, no matter what economic hardships it may entail. In other words, the SDI will only pave the way for a new, more dangerous, and more extensive arms race. That is why we are strongly against this project.

[Furumoto] The United States claims that "the SDI will be useful for the abolition of nuclear weapons."

[Zatsepin] While in office, President Johnson once said, "Great Britain became the world's ruler because it commanded the sea. In modern times, one who commands space rules the world." The United States has consistently pursued this goal. I am sure the SDI's goal is to attain military superiority through the high-tech field, in which they believe they are ahead of us. The second purpose is to strangle the Soviet Union to death economically by forcing a new arms race upon us.

[Furumoto] The Reagan administration is pressing the Japanese Government and Japanese firms to participate in SDI development.

[Zatsepin] I think that, for the present, the Japanese industrial circles are cautious about providing technical cooperation to the United States in the military field (including the SDI). For one thing, they fear that if they render technical cooperation, all research results attained by Japanese firms for use in production in the private sector would be used by the United States for military purposes. Naturally, (for the sake of secrecy), the United States would not permit Japanese firms to transfer their new technologies to the private sector.

In that event, Japanese firms would make money in the military field but lose much of the private-sector market. I think that is why they are cautious about participating in the SDI.

There is another factor: Some Japanese businessmen realize that "an endless arms race is very dangerous to the world." I believe that this purely humanitarian factor is also responsible for the caution.

[Furumoto] Some Japanese experts say that they expect that participation in SDI research will promote technical innovation, mainly in electronics.

[Zatsepin] Sure, that might be so. But it is a mistake to attach importance to that aspect alone. You have to ponder how perilous the development of such new weapons would be to the world. When the atom and the hydrogen bombs were newly developed, they did not make humankind that much happier. The result was the opposite. I frequently feel that the Japanese are often indifferent to the (Disarmament) controversy between the United States and the Soviet Union; that is, they take the attitude of an onlooker. The same is true with the SDI.

[Furumoto] Some experts think that if Japan participates in SDI research, it would provoke the Soviet Union and increase the danger that the Soviet Union might mount a nuclear attack on Japan.

[Zatsepin] I am sure they mean to say that, feeling a sense of crisis, the Soviet Union may launch a preemptive attack before the SDI program is completed. But we well know that if we did that, we would receive a retaliatory blow, and the whole world would be destroyed. Therefore, there will be no such contingency.

Let me briefly digress. When a certain Japanese recently asked me about the possibility of "the Soviet Union attacking Japan," I gave this answer: Well, suppose there is going to be an attack on Japan. If I were a soldier, I would not land on Hokkaido but try to sweep all of Japan at one stroke, including Honshu. What would happen then? Since industrial areas would be destroyed by the Japanese themselves before the battle started, I would only find the scorched earth and a listless people who had lost their will to work as hard as before...

It would be meaningless for the Soviet Union to occupy a Japan in such a state.

[Furumoto] If the general secretary should fail to stop the Reagan administration's SDI program, what would happen?

[Zatsepin] If the United States completes a space defense system like the SDI, the Soviet Union would become defenseless against a U.S. nuclear attack. The Soviet Union would be compelled to develop a formidable offensive weapon powerful enough to penetrate the U.S. defense network or its own space defense system (similar to the SDI).

The U.S. claim that "the Soviet Union has overtaken the United States in space weapons development" is totally unfounded, and it is nothing more than a propaganda ploy. The interview took place in the reception room on the first floor of the TASS Tokyo Bureau in Shibuya District, Tokyo. At first, Mr Zatsepin carefully chose each word to answer my questions, but as he went along, he grew hotter and hotter and finally began to speak very quickly in Russian.

Normally, a senior TASS official speaks for the Kremlin from beginning to end, and it is unusual for him to express a bold, in-depth view, as Mr Zatsepin did, regarding issues like the question of Japanese participation in the SDI program.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

BEIJING REVIEW ON SPACE ARMS RIVALRY

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English Vol 28 No 49, 9 Dec 85 pp 15-16

[Article by Sa Benwang]

[Text] **C**ONCERNED people around the world are closely following the development of space weapons initiatives by the United States and the Soviet Union, repeatedly demanding that the two superpowers stop such competition.

In recent years, the United States and the Soviet Union have each launched programmes for the development of space weapons. This new trend has raised the curtain on a new stage in the US-Soviet arms race, marking yet again a qualitative escalation. This is manifested in contest between the two to extend their military power into outer space, characterized by expansion from a battle-support role to its overall militarization. Furthermore, their stress on improving military strength has shifted from an emphasis on offensive nuclear forces to a new generation of laser directed energy weapons used for both offensive and defensive measures. The rivalry for superiority has turned from the nuclear domain to that of outer space, and their military strategy has added space strategy to conventional and nuclear strategies.

The "High Frontier"

During the four postwar decades, the United States and the Soviet Union have been stepping up their arms race. However, whereas previously their rivalry has been restricted to a contest for the domination of land, sea and air, now it is extended to outer space.

With the formulation of new outer space weapon projects, both the United States and the Soviet Union have started developing their outer space military power and have initiated a large-scale scrambling for the occupation of the "high frontier" — outer space. In their view, those who command outer space will exercise global control. Because of the enormity of such a prospect, space arms competition has become the

The US and USSR are scrambling for the occupation of the "high frontier." In their view, those who command outer space will control the world.

central issue in the arms race between the two superpowers.

Overall Militarization

The US-Soviet outer space competition began early in 1957. According to Western press reports, by the end of 1984, the United States had launched 1,029 satellites and space ships, and the Soviet Union 2,020. The space material launched by the two countries accounts for more than 94 percent of the total. From the very beginning, their space activities have had an obvious military purpose. About 70 percent of the satellites launched by the Soviet Union and the United States have either directly or indirectly been used for military purposes. Of this outer space equipment, many have been spy satellites (for photo or electronic reconnaissance), early warning satellites (for nuclear attack symptom surveillance), communication satellites (for strategic and tactical command and communication), geodetic satellites (for military targets survey) and navigation satellites (for pinpointing location of nuclear submarines, warships and aircraft). Until now, the use of these satellites has been confined to an auxiliary battle-support role.

Outer space weapon systems that are now being researched and developed by the United States and the Soviet Union are advanced space-based strike weapons, capable of attacking targets not only in outer space, but also on the ground, on the sea and in the air.

New Generation of Laser Weapons

The emphasis on strategic arms build-up has turned from the modernization of offensive nuclear force to developing a new generation of directed-energy weapons, which combine offensive and defensive uses, strategic and tactical purposes, and frontline and auxiliary battle-support systems into one.

Since mankind entered the nuclear age in July 1945, with the first explosion of an atom bomb, offensive nuclear forces have played the starring role in military strength and development. The two superpowers have each developed an offensive nuclear "triad" consisting of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM), submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBM) and strategic bombers, as the pillars of their military forces. Although in the 1960s the two countries had deployed land-based anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems, they have since either dismantled or halted further ABM deployment because of their ineffectiveness in dealing with large-scale nuclear attack.

In the 1980s, the United States and the Soviet Union resumed their research and development of strategic defence systems with space-based laser (directed-energy) weapons. Directed-energy and other high-tech systems can not only be used to destroy large numbers of attacking ballistic missiles, but also bear the potential for building a new generation of weapon systems with both of-

fensive and defensive capabilities. Used defensively, laser weapons can destroy strategic ballistic missiles and neutralize cruise missiles, and can even be integrated with anti-satellite (ASAT) and anti-bomber systems, making an overall defence system. Used offensively, laser weapons can launch space-to-space, space-to-air and space-to-surface attacks. Laser weapon systems are characterized by high speed (speed of light), high accuracy (almost 100 per cent accurate), total effectiveness (hard to protect against), limited side effects (no radio-activity) and multiple uses (for strategic, operational and tactical purposes, in survey, control and battle). If the problems of energy and durability can be solved, laser weapons can be developed into the most advanced form of weaponry since nuclear arms.

Race for Outer Space Control

The arms race has shifted from a race for nuclear superiority to one for the control of outer space. Having developed for the last 40 years, nuclear arsenals possessed by the two superpowers have reached a high level of perfection, with both the United States and the Soviet Union reaching a saturation point in their number of nuclear weapons. The power ratio of the warheads now approaches the theoretical realm. At least for the duration of this century, both the United States and the Soviet Union will continue their efforts to improve the accuracy and durability of their nuclear arms. Both,

The qualitative escalation of the arms race in outer space will certainly have a profound effect on the world's strategic situation, first and foremost in the military realm.

however, have come to realize that neither will be able to break the present military balance by relying solely on improving nuclear weapons.

Some analysts hold that both the United States and the Soviet Union now consider strategic defence a possible end to their stalemate. If either establishes an effective strategic defence system, and captures an overwhelming "first strike" capability, it could get them military upper hand over its counterpart.

Space Strategy

The main components of military strategy will include space strategy, as well as conventional and nuclear strategies.

Nuclear strategy has developed and evolved with the improvement of nuclear arms. Since World War II, nuclear strategy and conventional strategy have been the point of convergence in the military strategies of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Now it is inevitable that the development of outer space weaponry will spark transformations in military strategy, operational theory, war patterns, and defence organization and establishment. In fact, the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative itself constitutes a major revision to the nuclear strategic concept of mutual assured destruction (MAD), and suggests a change from a theory of "nuclear deterrence" to a "war-fighting" strategy. Succeeding the battlefronts of ground, sea and air, outer space will become the "fourth front." The theory of contending for control of outer space, the tactics involved in waging war in outer space and the new military force of outer space have been designed and put forward. Some are currently being developed. Early in 1964, the Soviet Union established its Space Defence Command under the National Air Defence Force, while the United States established its Air Force Space Command and Navy Space Command in 1982 and 1984 respectively. In September 1985, the United States formally established the United Space Command.

The curtain has been raised for a new round in the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. Its implications have not yet been fully revealed and its future is difficult to predict. However, the qualitative escalation of the arms race in outer space will certainly have a profound effect on the world's strategic situation, first and foremost in the military realm. □

/8309

CSO: 5200/4012

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S BRANDT ON GENEVA SUMMIT, TALKS IN WASHINGTON

LD241052 Hamburg DPA in German 0002 GMT 24 Nov 83

[Text] Bonn, 24 Nov (DPA) -- The dialogue between the two superpowers has been "secured for a while" by the Geneva talks between U.S. President Reagan and Soviet party leader Gorbachev, according to SPD Chairman Willy Brandt. Speaking on Deutschlandfunk on Sunday, Brandt said that at any event there would be an attempt to continue the dialogue.

In Brandt's view, the decisive factor for the good result of the Geneva summit was the recognition on both sides that a nuclear war between the superpowers cannot be won and that "to this extent they depend on each other as partners". As was predictable, both sides had met now on the basis of once again increased armaments. "Now they seem to want to make the attempt to move a bit down from there," Brandt said, "that is basically a revolutionary occurrence". The SPD chairman ascribed this among other things to the fact that the Soviet Union and also the United States have an economic interest in unburdening their state budgets from armaments expenditure.

Brandt reaffirmed his assessment that Geneva had opened up for Europe and the Federal Republic a new opportunity for a second phase of detente and cooperation. Apart from the subjects which "the superpowers" discussed with one another, there were for example the questions of travel, humanitarian concessions, and limited confidence-building measures, including (that) of a zone free of chemical and nuclear weapons.

Brandt, who was in Washington shortly before the summit, spoke unusually positively about his reception in the United States. He felt "that he had returned home." Brandt compared some of his talks with those in the "best years", which had been for him his years as mayor of Berlin. Some fears which the SPD had expressed particularly about Reagan would today certainly be formulated differently from a few years ago, Brandt said. But he also stressed that the Social Democrats had never adopted a stance directed against the United States.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2580

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S EHMKE SAYS PARTIAL CRUISE WITHDRAWAL 'FEASIBLE'

LD231246 Hamburg DPA in German 1043 GMT 23 Nov 85

[Text] Bonn, 23 Nov (DPA) -- Following the Geneva summit between U.S. President Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, the deputy chairman of the SPD group, Horst Ehmke, said that a partial withdrawal of the Pershing-2 missiles from the Federal Republic is feasible. The summit meeting made a corresponding interim agreement on intermediate nuclear force in the Geneva disarmament negotiations between the United States and Soviet Union possible, Ehmke said on Saturday on "Sender Freies Berlin." In that case, however, the short-range missiles which the Soviet Union had been deploying since the start of Western counter-arming must also be withdrawn.

In the SPD politician's view, an interim agreement could allow the Soviet Union's remaining 140 SS-20 missiles in Europe [words indistinct] to be balanced by cruise missiles in the West. The British and French nuclear weapons could remain outside the discussions in the first round. Ehmke called on the Federal Government to press for the withdrawal of the Soviet short-range missiles in the GDR and CSSR since these missiles posed an additional threat to the Federal Republic. A text of the interview was prereleased by the station.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2580

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG'S KOHL EXPRESSES SUPPORT FOR GENEVA SUMMIT

LD061142 Hamburg DPA in German 0952 GMT 6 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, 6 Dec (DPA) -- The FRG wants to support the application of the results of the Geneva summit between Ronald Reagan, the U.S. President, and Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet party leader, for future policy. At a reception for the Bonn diplomatic corps, to which about 120 foreign ambassadors attended, Helmut Kohl, the federal chancellor, said at Schaumburg Palace that the protection and strengthening of world peace is not only a matter for the superpowers, but also a duty for us all: "Let us see to it that the impulses from Geneva lead to concrete agreements, to a strengthening of peace here in Europe and everywhere in the world."

Kohl said that the FRG supports the joint declaration by Reagan and Gorbachev in which it was stated that no one can win a nuclear war, and that such a war should never be allowed to take place. The government also welcomes the aim of preventing an arms race in space and of ending it on earth. Additionally, nuclear weapons should be reduced and strategic stability strengthened.

The chancellor expressed the hope that, in a divided Germany, chances for people to come together would improve. Relations between the two states in Germany have developed positively during his 3-year term in office, he said. "It is important to stress that it has been possible to keep these relations viable, even during difficult times in world politics." Through his meeting with Erich Honecker, chairman of the GDR Council of State, in Moscow in March, an additional impetus had come into the relationship.

In his address, Kohl touched on the situation in the EC, warned against European pessimism and referred to the fact that progress in most fields is only to be achieved through a long-term process. The supposition that one could set up a European or a world order once and for all, and then turn to more pleasant things in politics is a misconception, he said. "In fact, politics is a constant process in which we pursue targets, score successes, and must overcome setbacks."

The chancellor also dwelled on the situation in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Near and Middle East. In the Sahel countries, a clear improvement is needed. The problems have not yet been eliminated, but emergency aid could, however, be used as an intermediary plan of action. The volunteer program agreed upon between Bonn and Paris should make a contribution to the development of the countries of Africa, he said.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2580

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

NORWEGIAN PAPERS REACT TO SUMMIT WITH CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM

PM041645 [Editorial Report] Norwegian newspapers of 22 November 1985 carry editorials commenting on the outcome of the Geneva summit. Their reaction is one of cautious optimism. Oslo's ARBEIDERBLADET in its page 4 editorial welcomes the renewal of contacts between the superpowers despite the lack of any concrete agreements at the summit: "Political observers with a shop-keeper's mentality will perhaps pay most attention to the fact that nothing particularly concrete emerged from the summit in Geneva. The only concrete thing, if we are to limit ourselves to the text of the joint communique, was actually an agreement to open a new U.S. consulate in Kiev and a new Soviet consulate in New York! But this is not the most important aspect of the summit. The most important thing about the summit was something entirely different: After the summit there is now a completely different atmosphere between the superpowers than there was before it, that Reagan and Gorbachev are now on speaking terms, they have decided to meet again, they have laid the foundation for negotiations on arms control and disarmament, they have both undertaken to refrain from seeking military superiority, and, now least, they have jointly stated that a nuclear war cannot be won and should therefore never be fought."

Oslo's AFTENPOSTEN in its page 2 editorial points out the importance of the personal contact created between the two leaders in Geneva: "Through such personal contacts the mutual confidence is created which is the prerequisite for subsequent real detente between the two states."

AFTENPOSTEN concludes by advising caution and stressing the difficulty of the tasks that lie ahead: "The firm handshakes, the small talk in front of the fire, and the dinner speeches dedicated to peace and understanding between peoples cannot conceal the fact that Reagan and Gorbachev did not achieve a concrete breakthrough on the vital problems dividing the United States and the Soviet Union. They have a long way to go before the work of clearing away the most dangerous areas of conflict can begin. But they did meet before it was too late. They have given the world a new chance."

/9599

CSO: 5200/2581

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

DENMARK'S SDP SECURITY SPOKESMAN CALLS SUMMIT A BREAKTHROUGH

FM281417 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 22 Nov 85 p 5

["Tho" report: "Budtz on Geneva"]

[Text] Copenhagen--"The meeting between the superpowers gives hope that the era of confrontation between them is at an end. The mere fact that they have been able to meet for talks represents an improvement in the international climate, but it is not a breakthrough. It could perhaps be the beginning of a breakthrough," Social Democratic security policy spokesman Lasse Budtz told BERLINGSKE TIDENDE.

"It is entirely logical that, if East-West relations and in particular the relationship between the superpowers improves significantly, this will have an immediate effect on the parliaments of individual countries, including Denmark's Folketing, and reach all the way into the Folketing's interim security Policy Committee," Budtz said. Nevertheless he was unwilling to see any concrete results in the negotiations, even though "the mere fact of a meeting is positive."

/7358

CSO: 5200/2569

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SETUBAL SPEAKS AT SHEVARDINADZE LUNCHEON IN USSR

PY121530 Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO in Portuguese 10 Dec 85 p 4

[Text] of speech delivered by Foreign Minister Otavio Setubal at a luncheon hosted by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on 9 November in Moscow

[Text] Mr Minister: I first wish to express my gratitude for the hospitality with which the Soviet Government has received me and my colleagues. We were likewise very impressed by your words which showed a personal knowledge of our country and its physical and human characteristics. We are sure that this knowledge will be an additional factor for strengthening the ties between Brazil and the Soviet Union.

Mr Minister, the contacts between our peoples have a long history. The work of Baron Langsdorff, which is currently being exhibited in Moscow, attests to the contribution of this eminent Russian diplomat and naturalist to the development of natural sciences in Brazil during the first decades of the 19th century.

While serving as consul in Liverpool, the Baron of Rio Branco, patron of Brazilian diplomacy, visited the beautiful Baltic Palmyra, now Leningrad, and actively participated in the 1894 International (4) theory. The potential importance of the relations between our two great nations did not escape the farighted vision of the great Brazilian diplomat. After that trip, which took place more than a century ago, he was the first to propose creating a regular and direct line of trade between the distant empires of Brazil and Russia.

The vicissitudes of contemporary history have inevitably influenced and will continue influencing the course of our relations. We believe that the important thing is that we naturally accept the illustrations stemming from history and geography, and that we dedicate ourselves to consolidating a stable, strong, and mature relationship.

Brazil is now going through a promising democratic process in its political and social life. Popular participation is becoming intense in all kinds, including representative institutions and social justice. The new Brazilian Republic, based on a broad alliance of political forces committed to democracy and progress, intends to undertake the transition toward a regime of sovereign institutions and to begin solving the various social and economic problems affecting our country.

A nation that is seeking to reorganize its national pattern on the basis of democracy and social justice cannot but enthusiastically identify itself with the principles of conduct which reflect these aspirations in the field of international relations. In this manner, the Brazilian commitment to the principle of sovereign equality stands

nations, its respect for the principles of self-determination and noninterference, and its support for the cause of peace and disarmament, have been strengthened.

We consider ourselves a pluralistic society which, on account of our historical background and ethnic and cultural makeup, turns naturally toward contacts with all nations. Universalism, a new horizon opened up by modern science and defined as the scope of peaceful coexistence by the San Francisco Charter, is one of the basic principles of our foreign relations. We do not believe in partial or exclusive visions or options in the field of foreign relations. Our desire is to cooperate only and equally with all countries, on the basis of nonintervention in domestic affairs, mutual respect, and reciprocal benefits.

Mr Minister, the international community received with hope and relief the Joint U.S.-Soviet declaration after the Geneva summit in November. It said that in a nuclear war there cannot be winners, and that one should not be started, and that neither of the two parties will try to obtain nuclear superiority over the other. Those words encourage the hope for peace of all mankind. Brazil in particular has reiterated its position of condemning the arms race, and of giving its sincere support for promoting negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament. We believe that the nuclear powers, especially the United States and the Soviet Union, have a special responsibility in the disarmament process, which should progress through an effective combination of bilateral and multilateral negotiations, mainly within the framework of the UN disarmament conference.

We also see a very clear connection between disarmament and economic and social development. The resources now used for the maintenance and improvement of destructive weapons should be used in nobler tasks, such as overcoming the misery which affects so many inhabitants of our planet.

Regarding this subject, I would like to recall that before the Geneva meeting, Jose Sarney, president of the Federative Republic of Brazil, sent a letter to CPSU Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev expressing his hope that the improvement in East-West relations and the resumption of negotiations on nuclear disarmament would pave the way for the desired transfer of human and material resources to the urgent and constructive tasks of socioeconomic development.

We also listened with great interest and optimism to the words of the CPSU secretary general during the important interview he granted to the international press in Geneva. His excellency said that all nations, whether capitalist and developed, socialist, or developing, have economic, social and ecological problems which must be solved through cooperation. He added that the Soviet Union could not isolate itself from the developing world, since the new policy, based on concrete realities, forces us all to search for answers to the problems of the countries which are struggling for a better life.

Mr Minister, Brazil is one of the many countries which are struggling to eliminate economic backwardness and give their population better standards of living. Particularly adverse conditions of the international economy have created serious difficulties for my country and many other Latin American and Third World countries. At this moment, through great domestic sacrifices, we are trying to overcome those difficulties and again take the road of economic and social development. Many aspects of the international economic order must be reviewed so as to permit a more just and harmonious coexistence among developed and developing countries.

Mr Minister, this is the first visit of a Brazilian foreign minister to the Soviet Union. It represents, as I have already said, the expression of an emerging reality in Brazil. It also coincides with the beginning of a phase of renewal in Soviet political life, which we witness with interest.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of relations between the Republic of Brazil and the Soviet Union. I hope that the meetings with Your Excellency and other high Soviet officials, as well as the bilateral decisions and documents resulting from them, may mark the conclusion of a period, and at the same time the opening of new prospects for the future.

I April I sent a letter to your illustrious predecessor Andrey Gromyko, now president of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, expressing our willingness to give more dynamism to Brazilian-Soviet relations through exchanging visits at government level; political consultations, resumption of the expansion of trade and economic relations, balanced cultural exchange, and the invigoration of scientific and technological cooperation.

Economic and commercial relations -- based since 1975 on an agreement for the supply of Soviet machinery and equipment to Brazil and of Brazilian products to the USSR, and on overcoming the difficulties of geographical distance and a severe mutual lack of information -- are a firm reality today. However, we must pay special attention to this field. I recognize that Brazil must have made a special effort for this because it must import more and with greater regularity we are to increase the total volume of bilateral trade, in order to be able to increase its own exports. Previously, we have bought hydroelectrical equipment and other heavy industry goods from the Soviet Union. We must now find alternative products to replace those which are being produced in Brazil and no longer bought abroad. We will thus put the 1985 bilateral agreement to a more effective use. This agreement will be extended in a ceremony that will take place during my stay in Moscow.

It is also with great pleasure that I learn of the progress of the talks between the Vale do Rio Doce Company and the V/O Tyazhpromekspert under the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, and that the two enterprises have signed a protocol of intent on several matters of common interest. In this connection we must also emphasize the cooperation projects in the iron and steel industry, coal supply, and the transfer of technology for the recovery of valuable minerals. The Brazilian side is now waiting for the Soviet side to state the financial and commercial conditions for the undertaking of these ventures, which, if carried out, may become meaningful examples of the technological and industrial capacity of the USSR, and pave the way for new joint ventures with Brazilian enterprises.

Coordinated efforts in third markets, at which we have a certain experience, may also create opportunities for mutually advantageous activities. Summing up, Mr Minister, I would like to express Brazil's desire to expand its area of economic activity with the Soviet Union, so as to equalize the trade balance between the two countries. The agreement for technical and economic cooperation which I will sign with the chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations will certainly give new strength to the initiative with an eye to this objective.

Scientific and technological cooperation also offers us ample possibilities, especially in view of the large number of personnel, and the knowledge and techniques that have been accumulated by the USSR in this field. On the other hand, Brazil, through what it has already accomplished, will also contribute to this exchange. We have recently acquired Soviet technology for the production of stacked from lumber. Based on the

technological and scientific cooperation agreement signed in 1981, other fields will certainly be explored, both at the level of applied technology and that of pure science.

Mr Minister, Your Excellency's visit to Brazil in 1980 as the head of the delegation representing the Soviet Parliament opened an important chapter in the development of our political relations. Since then, and following the talks begun by the delegation Your Excellency headed in Brasilia, the exchange of groups of parliamentarians has become a tradition which has helped very much in obtaining greater mutual knowledge. Brazilian congressmen still have pleasant recollections of the warm welcome they received from Your Excellency when visiting your native land, Georgia.

The warmth of Your Excellency's meeting with President Sarney in New York during the sessions of the 40th UN General Assembly showed once again the Brazilian and Soviet desire to intensify the dialogue at all levels in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence.

The consultations annually held by the Brazilian and Soviet delegations on topics on the agenda of the UN General Assembly are also a valuable channel of communications.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2009

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRC REAFFIRMS STAND ON BIOLOGICAL, BACTERIAL WEAPONS

HK280736 Hong Kong AFP in English 0728 GMT 28 Nov 85

[Text] Beijing, 28 Nov (AFP)--China today dismissed as "sheer fabrication" a Vietnamese accusation that it had begun biological and chemical weapons research.

The Vietnamese Army newspaper the QUAN DOI NHAN DAN charged Monday that China and the United States were preparing themselves for chemical and bacterial warfare.

Today, a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, questioned about the accusation, replied: "China, once having been a victim of biological and bacterial weapons, is all along opposed to such weapons."

The spokesman said that China had acceded to the international convention on the prohibition of the development, production or stockpiling of bacterial and biological weapons, and on the destruction of such weapons.

"We will solemnly fulfill the obligations we have undertaken" he said.

During the 1950-1953 Korean War, China accused U.S. forces of using bacterial weapons against its troops. Most Western historians consider this charge groundless.

Since China and Vietnam fought a brief but bloody border war in 1979, there have been repeated clashes on the Sino-Vietnamese frontier, and each country has accused the other of incursions into its territory.

/7358

CSO: 5200/4011

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWEGIAN FOREIGN MINISTRY ASKS FOR BROADER EUROPEAN SECURITY

PM031653 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 25 Nov 85 p 3

[Report by Morten Fyhn: "European Solution First"]

[Text] A nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area can only come about after broader European arrangements involving significant reductions in both nuclear and conventional forces on both sides of the East-West divide in Europe to as low as possible a balanced level. This is the conclusion of a comprehensive report from the Foreign Ministry published today.

The so-called zone committee, under the leadership of former under secretary of state, Ambassador Kjell Colding, is in part very critical of the idea of a zone in its unanimous report and gives a clear warning against the possible future establishment of a zone prior to or at the same time as a broader Nordic zone under such circumstances would raise a number of problems of crucial importance to Norway's security and would have repercussions for Norway's relationship with NATO.

At the same time the report says that it is vitally important that we should not act in such a way as to disrupt the U.S.-Soviet nuclear arms negotiations.

It is well known that a broader European security arrangement is not just around the corner. But the committee is not closing the door completely on Norwegian participation in the zone debate for this reason. On the contrary, the committee advocates that in the absence of a broader negotiated settlement we can engage in active work on the zone idea. The committee envisages that this could happen through Norway's continuing its endeavors to help promote the achievement of results in the various arms control and disarmament negotiations. At the same time Norway must help to ensure regular contacts and dialogue among the Nordic countries on the zone issue.

In the view of the committee the question of Norwegian involvement at civil servant level in joint Nordic investigation work on the zone idea could also arise at a later date. However, this would have to be against the background of progress achieved in the ongoing disarmament negotiations and of the discussion of these issues in NATO. Next weekend the first Nordic parliamentarians' conference on the zone will be held in Copenhagen. It is expected that Finland, with the support of the Swedish government, will propose a joint

Nordic report on the zone. The Norwegian Foreign Ministry report will undoubtedly be seen as a cold shower by the zone's most enthusiastic supporters.

The committee's task has been to produce an analysis whose aim is to make a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area a real possibility as part of a broader European arrangement and within the framework of Norway's membership of the Western Alliance. The report goes into great detail about the guarantees which the nuclear powers will have to give not to use or threaten to use nuclear arms against the zone states. These are the so-called negative security guarantees. The committee says of these that, regardless of their content, they raise the question of what faith one can have in declarations made, particularly in a war situation or when war threatens.

A Nordic zone arrangement which is intended to strengthen the zone states' security will also affect the nuclear arms deployed in areas bordering on the zone, such as the Kola peninsula and the Baltic area, the report states. Even though the Nordic countries may succeed in winning acceptance for their demands for reductions in, the thinning out of, or the total withdrawal of such weapons, it will nevertheless only be possible to diminish part of the threat to the zone. For the threat depends primarily not on the geographical location of the weapons but on which targets they can actually be used against.

In connection with the establishment of a possible future zone arrangement the Nordic countries must also demand measures and limitations affecting conventional weapons. This must be seen against the background of the Soviet Union's conventional superiority, the report states.

Verification questions have a central place in connection with a Nordic zone. The committee points out that the Nordic countries themselves only have part of the expertise and the resources needed for effective verification. A clear prerequisite for Soviet participation in verification in the territory embraced by a zone is that Soviet zones in which nuclear arms are banned or Soviet attenuation zones should be open to corresponding verification.

"It is possible that the nuclear powers will demand a more comprehensive right of inspection in the context of negative security guarantees. Such access could be used for unreasonable interference in the arrangements or internal affairs of the zone states. For this reason the committee considers it extremely important that verification arrangements be so shaped that abuses of this nature can be prevented."

According to the committee Norwegian participation in a zone is not in itself irreconcilable with NATO membership or with continued Norwegian involvement in integrated defense cooperation. However, a Nordic zone arrangement could conflict with allied defense strategy. Steps taken to implement a zone in the Nordic area would therefore have repercussions for our relationship with NATO unless they happen with the understanding of our allies and with the involvement of the nuclear states.

If Norway renounces the nuclear option--that is, the possibility of being defended with such weapons--and extends its base policy to cover wartime or times when there is the threat of war, this could create fears or expectations that this is a step in the direction of neutrality. Consequently Norway will probably feel the need to strengthen political and military cooperation with its allies, the committee writes.

If Norway renounces the nuclear option, the committee believes that this could weaken its allies' willingness and ability to come to Norway's aid in a crisis or a war. This could also have a negative effect on their interest in taking part in exercises in Norway in peacetime. In addition the committee takes the view that, even if there were an extension of Norway's self-imposed restrictions, it is unlikely that Norway would become a less likely target for nuclear attack or threats of such an attack. "The important consideration in this context is the country's strategic position and importance in the field of tension between the two superpowers," the report states.

The committee also considers that uncertainty could arise about Norway's position within NATO and this could lead to ideas on the Eastern side that it could, for example, exert political and military pressure on Norway. The committee therefore attaches decisive importance to Norway's continued ability to take a full part in alliance cooperation.

/9599

CSO: 5200/2581

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S ZAGLADIN ON USSR PEACE, DISARMAMENT ACTIONS

AU030601 Moscow OBSHCHESTVENNYE NAUKI in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 85 (signed to press 24 Oct 85) pp 5-27

[Article by V.V. Zagladin, doctor of philosophical sciences, "specialist for questions of the communist and workers movement, international relations, and global problems of the contemporary period": "The Soviet Peace Program: Essence, Implementation, Development" -- "The Article is based on the section of the collective monograph 'The Question of All Questions. Struggle for Peace and Historical Fate of Mankind.' Moscow, Politizdat, 1985" -- passages in uppercase published in italics, words between slant-lines published in widespaced print]

[Text] At the beginning of the eighties, mankind came face to face with a threat that was unprecedented in its nature. The aggressive forces of imperialism and, primarily, of U.S. imperialism, proclaimed a "crusade" against socialism and all forces of social progress and launched a new round of military preparations. As a result, the threat of war increased. The world moved yet another step closer to the abyss of a nuclear catastrophe.

However, this does not at all mean that mankind has been left without any hope of salvation. On the contrary, the actions of the militarist forces provoke active counteractions by the peace-loving forces and the forces struggling for further social progress. The mobilization of these forces and their conscious actions, imbued with the sense of profound responsibility for the future of civilization, inspire optimism. And the community of socialist countries and the effective coordinated policy of these countries in the international arena now represent a most important factor of optimism. The peace-loving foreign policy of the countries of socialism and their constructive proposals aimed at solving all acute and still unsolved problems by political means and through negotiations, acquire even greater importance in the new, more difficult conditions. And of course, the broad and, it can be said, all-embracing international political platform contained in the Soviet Peace Program has now become even more attractive for the peoples.

In our period the growth of the proportional weight of international questions in the total sum of questions of state politics is characteristic of all countries of the world. And this is not surprising. The 20th Century in general and its second half in particular has been a period of rapid development in the processes of internationalization of production and trade and, consequently, of the process of internationalization of the entire public life. There are no longer any countries in the world which would live in isolation and seclusion and be separated from the international division of labor, world trade, and scientific-technological, cultural, and tourist exchanges. In these conditions foreign policy problems have come to occupy a very significant place in the policy of every state.

The problem of war and peace has become especially acute in our era. The contemporary military equipment, the weapons that know no limits to their range and possess virtually unlimited strike capabilities, have turned the prevention of a new world war into a task of truly extraordinary relevance. And this fact in its turn could not but increase -- and increase very seriously at that -- the attention of all peoples and all states toward foreign political affairs.

Foreign policy has always had a special and vitally important significance for the Soviet Union. The Republic of the Soviets faced two tasks of gigantic difficulty immediately after the October Revolution. The construction of a new, unprecedented society in the country was one of these two tasks. "...The second of the gigantic difficulties that lay on its shoulders," V.I. Lenin said, "was the international question." And he defined it precisely: What was involved was the "quarrel with real international imperialism and its real, hostile attitude to us." (Footnote 1) (V.I. Lenin: "Complete Collected Works," Vol 36, pp 8, 10) These two tasks have accompanied our people along the entire historical road they traversed. We could not solve the first of the two tasks, that is, the task of building socialism, without solving the second one; vice versa, it was impossible to solve the second task, that is, the task of protecting ourselves against the hostile attitude of imperialism, without building socialism and without strengthening it politically, economically, and militarily.

In our time the Communist Party and its Central Committee, devoting an ever increasing attention to foreign policy problems, take account of the great importance of the general state of affairs in the world for the successful construction of communism in the USSR. The 26th CPSU Congress declared: "DEFENDING PEACE -- AT THIS TIME THERE IS NO MORE IMPORTANT TASK IN INTERNATIONAL FIELD FOR OUR PARTY. FOR OUR PEOPLE, AND FOR ALL PEOPLES OF THE PLANET. Defending peace, we are working not only for the people living now, not only for our children and grandchildren; we are working for the happiness of dozens of future generations. (Footnote 2) ("Documents of the 26th CPSU Congress." Moscow, 1981, p 31)

And thus, foreign policy has always been of enormous importance for the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, it was only in the seventies that such an all-embracing plan of international activity as the Soviet Peace Program came into being. What is involved in this connection is the fact that only at that time were such international conditions created as, first, demanded the advancement of such a plan and, second, provided ground for hopes that such a plan could be implemented.

Serious changes began to show in international life during the sixties and especially in the second half of the sixties. The "cold war" began gradually to yield its positions: It resisted, but it was nevertheless no longer able to restrain the process of more or less normal relations being arranged between the states of the two opposite social systems. In this situation the need also arose for major constructive initiatives that would deal with the main questions of international development and point out the way to a more energetic movement forward. On the other hand, the gradually changing correlation of forces in the world arena to the advantage of socialism and all those states and groups of society which advocated peace and relaxation of tension, made it realistically possible to work out a political course that would lead to a serious transformation of international relations on a worldwide scale.

In what specifically did this change in the correlation of forces, discussed here, find its expression?

First, by the beginning of the seventies, the socialist countries had grown into an economic quantity which surpassed each of the existing power centers of imperialism, that is, the United States, Western Europe, and Japan, and in a number of indexes it firmly moved to the first place in the world.

Second, the socialist community has achieved military parity with the block of imperialist states, something that objectively serves the cause of preservation of peace on our planet.

Third, following the collapse of the last (the Portuguese colonial empire, the number and influence of the liberated countries, consistently striving against war and aggression and for the peaceful and independent development of all peoples, have significantly grown. This was distinctly manifested in particular at the conference of the heads of nonaligned states and their governments in Havana in 1979 and in Delhi in 1983.

Fourth, in the seventies the international workers movement acted very resolutely in defense of peace and for a transition to the policy of relaxation of tension. This was convincingly expressed in the results of work of the Moscow International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties in 1969 and in the results of work of the regional meetings of Communists of Europe, the United States, the Arab East, and the African countries which were held in the seventies and at the beginning of the eighties. It also found its expression in the Socialist International's positions on international questions (let us recall: in Helsinki in 1978 the Socialist International held its first ever conference on disarmament). It was also clearly revealed in the actions of trade union organizations of various orientations.

Fifth, in the capitalist states, the positions of the workers class and of democratic, antimonopolist, and especially antiwar forces have been strengthened to the detriment of the forces of war and reaction, the forces of social and national oppression.

And finally, sixth, at the beginning of the seventies a certain part of the ruling circles of several Western (primarily Western European) countries embarked on the road of a realistic approach to international affairs. The recognition of the fact that the only possible alternative to peaceful coexistence is mutual destruction in the flames of a nuclear war gained the upper hand.

As can be seen, during the sixties and seventies the changes in the correlation of forces affected virtually all aspects of both international life and the internal life of states. Consequently, it was possible to speak about changes in the correlation of the military and economic forces of the two systems, about a change in the correlation of forces between the champions of peace and the opponents of peace, about shifts in the correlation of class-political forces in the world arena and in the individual capitalist countries, and so forth; that is, in the final analysis, about a CHANGE IN THE CORRELATION OF FORCES AS A WHOLE TO THE ADVANTAGE OF PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Taking account of all these conditions and circumstances in their totality, the Soviet leadership reached the conclusion that it was possible and necessary to put forth a major, large-scale foreign policy program which would embrace all the main problems of international development, that is, the problems the solving of which would really ease world tension, consolidate the security of peoples, and remove the threat of war. In this connection the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government proceeded from the fact that what should be involved in this connection was a program that would include realistic and feasible measures -- feasible, naturally, provided that all countries showed good will -- and a program that would win broad support among states and different social forces.

Our party's understanding of the prospects of the development of the international situation and of the basic tasks in the sphere of international politics was outlined in the accountability report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 24th CPSU Congress on 30 March 1971. Literally as early as the next day, the press in various countries wrote about the Soviet Peace Program. Since then this term has firmly entered the vocabulary of universally recognized political concepts.

Five years later, on 14 February 1976, the 25th CPSU Congress supplemented the Peace Program by proclaiming the program of further struggle for peace and international cooperation, for freedom and independence of peoples. Another 3 years later, on 23 February 1981, the 26th CPSU Congress formulated new proposals which were characterized in the CPSU Central Committee's accountability report as an "organic extension and development of our Peace Program as applied to the most burning and topical problems of international life in our period." (Footnote 3) (ibid.,) the November (1982) CPSU Central Committee plenum declared with all determination: "...Soviet foreign policy has been and continues to be such as was determined by decisions of the 24th, 25th, and 26th congresses of our party. (Footnote 4) ("Documents of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 22 November 1982," Moscow, 1982, p. 11)

At the extraordinary March (1985) Plenum it was again confirmed in the speech delivered by M.S. Gorbachev: "In the sphere of foreign policy, our course is clear and consistent. It is the course of peace and progress." (Footnote 5) ("Documents of the Extraordinary CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 31 March 1985," Moscow, 1985, p. 11)

Thus, what is involved is a unified foreign policy program that has developed and evolved over time. In what direction has this evolution moved? What in the Peace Program has remained and continues to remain unchanged, and what is changing? First of all it must be stated that this program is based on a firm foundation. The foundation are the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy, the principles emanating from the very essence of the Soviet social system. The social ownership relations, established in our country after the October Revolution, liquidated all social possibility for the Soviet state to pursue any other policy but the policy of peace. In our country there are no classes or social groups that could act as initiators of a policy of aggression or of enmeshment of other peoples. There are no forces that would enrich themselves with incomes from the capital exported to foreign countries. There are no social forces or groups that would build their personal prosperity on the production of instruments of destruction of people.

The socialist reorganization of society in our country required a long period and considerable efforts. However, there is one sphere of activity where the time needed for its reorganization is counted in days, if not hours: this is the sphere of foreign policy. A radical turn was made immediately in this sphere with the adoption of Lenin's Peace Decree. The Peace Decree was followed by other documents, and all of them were permeated with the same ideas: stable, democratic peace among peoples; peaceful coexistence between states independently of their social systems; all-sided support for the aspirations of peoples to freedom and independent development; comprehensive democratization of international relations; and active interaction between the state policy of socialist states and the forces representing the public opinion, the forces of peace on all continents.

Soviet foreign policy steadfastly follows these basic principles. They have been given their expression in the new USSR Constitution, which states in Article 78: "The USSR foreign policy is aimed at ensuring favorable international conditions for the construction of communism in the USSR, protecting the Soviet Union's state interests,

strengthening the positions of world socialism, providing support for the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress, preventing aggressive wars, achieving general and complete disarmament, and consistent implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems."

THE SOVIET PEACE PROGRAM OF THE 24TH, 25TH, AND 26TH CONGRESSES ESSENTIALLY REPRESENTS A CONSISTENT EXTENSION OF THE IDEAS OF LENIN'S PEACE DECREE. The decree's principles, that is, the main, general principles of the USSR's foreign policy, represent the invariable and stable foundation of that program, no matter what stage of its development we may consider. It can be said that the Peace Program represents the CONCRETE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES of the USSR's foreign policy at the contemporary stage of world development. It goes without saying that the Peace Program DOES NOT COVER ALL ASPECTS OF SOVIET INTERNATIONAL POLICY; primarily, it embraces the problems concerning relations between states with opposite social systems. Solving the problem of preventing a nuclear war and the future of all mankind realistically depends on the nature and dynamics of relations between these states in practice.

The Soviet Union has never considered the resolution of contradictions between the two systems by military means as being either possible or necessary or expedient. It was not socialism but precisely imperialism that, beginning in 1917, counted on using force to destroy socialism, to liquidate it or, as was said later, to "roll it back." In the mid-seventies when the general crisis of capitalism noticeably deepened and when it became clear that under the conditions of detente the forces of social progress felt considerably better than the forces of militarism and reaction, imperialism made its next new attempt to achieve a social revanche. This resulted in a significant and truly dangerous deterioration of the world situation.

However, it is not enough simply to say that the Peace Program embraces the problems of relations between the socialist and imperialist countries. It is more correct to say: This program concerns fundamental problems connected with maintaining and strengthening general peace and solving the urgent problems that affect the interests of all mankind, the interests of freedom and the independence of peoples, the problems engendered by the aggressive, anti-popular activity of the reactionary and imperialist forces.

What then is the specific basic content of the Soviet Peace Program? It has been determined on the basis of careful analysis of the world situation and, of course, in accordance with the main goal of our entire policy: that is, the consolidation of peace.

The 24th CPSU Congress determined the Peace Program at a time when U.S. imperialism's barbaric war in Vietnam was still in progress. A dangerous tension was maintained in the Middle East. Therefore, the first point of the program was the proposition on the NEED TO LIQUIDATE THE EXISTING HOTBEDS OF WAR. The congress' decisions included the following demands:

"The hotbeds of war in Southeast Asia and the Middle East must be liquidated, and a political settlement based on respect for the legitimate rights of the states and peoples that have been subjected to aggression must be promoted in these regions.

"All acts of aggression or international arbitrariness must be immediately and firmly rebuffed. The potential of the United Nations should also be fully utilized for this purpose." (Footnote 6) ("Documents of the 24th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1971, p 29)

By the time of the 23rd Congress, the Vietnam war had ended with the defeat of the aggressor. The Soviet Union did everything necessary to help the heroic people of that country defend their independence. It also made its contribution to the task of preparing the accords [agreements] that led to the conclusion of the war. Soon after Vietnam's victory, the people of Laos also liberated themselves from usurpers and foreign occupiers.

The Soviet Union also made considerable efforts to liquidate the hotbed of war in the Middle East. Soviet diplomacy especially intensified its activity after the armed conflict that broke out between Israel and the Arab countries in October 1973 had clearly demonstrated to the whole world the dangerous situation which had developed in that region. As a result of multilateral efforts with the USSR's decisive participation, an accord was achieved on convening the Middle East peace conference. The conference opened in Geneva on 22 December 1973. During the first stage of its work, the conference resolved the question of a special mechanism for a settlement in the Middle East; an agreement was reached on the ways of continuing the work of the conference. But unfortunately, Israeli and U.S. opposition made it impossible to utilize the possibilities that had opened up.

At the time of the opening of the 24th Congress, the Middle East region continued to represent a source of threat to peace. It was in accordance with this situation that the Soviet program of further struggle for peace includes the following proposals: "To concentrate the efforts of peace-loving states on liquidating the existing hotbed of war and, first and foremost, on achieving a just and durable settlement in the Middle East. In connection with this settlement the states involved should consider the question of helping end the armed race in the Middle East." (Footnote 7) ("Documents of the 24th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1974, p. 26)

The 26th CPSU Congress once again addressed the Middle East problem. During the period since the previous party forum, the hotbed of war there had by no means been liquidated. Moreover, the situation again became tense as a result of the Camp David policy of division pursued by the United States. Taking account of the course of events, the CPSU proposed a "return to the honest collective search for a comprehensive settlement on a just and realistic basis." (Footnote 8) ("Documents of the 26th CPSU Congress," p. 14)

Since 1971 the problem of the need to strive for recognition by all states of the principle of renunciation of the use of force has been sharply raised in the Peace Program. In very close and indissoluble linkage with the task of liquidating the hotbeds of war. "The renunciation of the use of force and of the threat of its use for settling disputes," it was stated at the 24th CPSU Congress, "must become the law of international life. For its part the Soviet Union proposes to the countries sharing this approach to conclude the necessary bilateral or regional treaties [agreements]." (Footnote 9) ("Documents of the 24th CPSU Congress," p. 29) Taking account of the intensifying aggressiveness of imperialism, the 25th CPSU Congress concentrated its attention on the ways of stopping the growing confrontation and ensuring a return to detente. And the essence of detente lies, first and foremost, in a renunciation of the use of methods of force to solve disputes that arise.

The aforementioned propositions were subsequently concretely formulated in a number of Soviet diplomatic documents, many of which were approved by the United Nations.

The second point of the program included the propositions concerning a FINAL-AND DEFINITE CIRCUMSCRIPTION OF THE RESULTS OF WORLD WAR II IN EUROPE. Despite the fact that by then more than a quarter of a century had passed since the rout of Hitlerism, this task continued to be intensely topical. Enjoying the support of certain circles in the United States as well as a number of Western European countries, the revanchist elements in the FRG did not hide (and do not hide now) their intention to strive for the restoration of the "third reich" in one form or another. They refused to recognize the borders established on the continent in the postwar years and more and more openly expressed their pretensions to the possession of modern weapons, including nuclear weapons. The FRG's military-industrial complex aspired to exercising a decisive influence on the country's policies. All this also made the consolidation of European peace an extraordinarily topical task.

Taking this into consideration, the 24th CPSU Congress made the following important principled proposal:

"On the basis of final and definite recognition of territorial changes that have taken place in Europe as a result of World War II, to make a fundamental turn toward detente and peace on this continent, and to ensure the convening and success of the all-European conference.

"To do everything to ensure collective security in Europe. We confirm the readiness, jointly expressed by member-countries of the defense Warsaw Pact, to simultaneously abolish this pact and the North Atlantic Alliance or, as a first step, to liquidate their military organizations." (Footnote 10) (Ibid., pp 29-30)

Many changes took place in Europe in the period between the 24th and 25th CPSU Congress. The all-European conference in Helsinki -- to the preparation, convening, and successful work of which the USSR made a noticeable contribution -- drew the line under the results of World War II. The conference's Final Act not only confirmed the borders that had been established on the continent and thereby dealt a serious blow to revanchism in all its manifestations, but also formulated the basic principles of further development of good neighborly relations and peaceful cooperation between the countries whose representatives affixed their signatures to it.

Taking account of the positive changes that have taken place on the European Continent, the 25th CPSU Congress set the task of "actively pursuing the policy aimed at fully implementing the Final Act of the all-European conference." (Footnote 11) ("Documents of the 25th CPSU Congress," p 26) Noting that the East-West relations in Europe were marked by a mutually advantageous and fruitful development during the period of detente, the 26th CPSU Congress declared: "We believe that the process initiated by the all-European conference must be continuous. All forms of negotiations, multilateral or bilateral, should be used to solve the problems that trouble Europe." (Footnote 12) ("Documents of the 26th CPSU Congress," p 25) The USSR is in favor of turning Europe into a zone of peace.

Simultaneously with the question of European security, the 25th CPSU Congress also raised the topic of Asian security: "...To carry out work to ensure security in Asia on the basis of joint efforts of states of that continent." (Footnote 13) ("Documents of the 25th CPSU Congress," p 26) These ideas were then further developed by the 26th CPSU Congress which declared itself, in particular, in favor of proclaiming nuclear-free zones in Africa and the Middle East, in addition to Latin America, and in favor of creating the zones of peace in Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean, and the Mediterranean Sea.

The thesis on the DEVELOPMENT OF MULTILATERAL COOPERATION BETWEEN PEOPLES ON A TRUE PEACE-LOVING BASIS represented an important proposition of the 1971 Peace Program. The 24th CPSU Congress made the following declaration in this connection: "The Soviet Union is ready to continue to deepen the relations of mutually beneficial cooperation in all spheres with the states that, for their part, strive for the same goal. Our country is ready to participate together with other interested states in solving such problems as the protection of natural environment, exploitation of energy and other natural resources, development of transportation and communications, prevention and liquidation of the most dangerous and widespread diseases, and research and conquest of outer space and the world's oceans." (Footnote 14) ("Documents of the 24th CPSU Congress," p 30)

In the 5-year period after the 24th CPSU Congress, the mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and a majority of Western European countries developed to a considerable extent. In particular, the practice of working out various long-term programs of this cooperation asserted itself. Measures were taken to activate interaction of all countries of the continent. The proposals made by the USSR in December 1975 to hold all-European congresses or interstate conferences on questions of cooperation in the spheres of environment protection and the development of transportation and energy were intended to serve this purpose. The discriminatory practices of Western states in relation to the countries of socialism continued to represent an obstacle to the development of mutually beneficial cooperation.

Taking into consideration both the achieved results and the existence of certain difficulties, the 25th Congress proposed:

"To do everything to deepen the relaxation of international tension and to embody it in concrete forms of mutually beneficial cooperation between states.... In conformity with the principles of peaceful coexistence, to consistently continue to develop the relations of long-term mutually beneficial cooperation in various spheres -- in politics, the economy, science, and culture -- with the United States, France, the FRG, Great Britain, Italy, Canada, Japan, and other capitalist states....

"To strive to eliminate discrimination and any other artificial barriers from international trade and to liquidate all manifestations of inequality, dictat, or exploitation in international economic relations." (Footnote 15) ("Documents of the 25th CPSU Congress," p 26)

The following proposition of the Peace Program was of a principled significance:

"The UN decisions on liquidating the remaining colonial regimes must be fully implemented. All manifestations of racism and apartheid to be subjected to general condemnation and boycott." (Footnote 16) ("Documents of the 24th CPSU Congress," p 30)

The 25th and 26th CPSU Congress wholly and completely confirmed the policy aimed at developing the solidarity of the Soviet Communists and the Soviet people with the strivings of the peoples of developing countries and at consolidating the alliance between world socialism and the forces born in the national liberation struggle.

THE SECTION CONCERNING THE PROBLEM OF ENDING THE ARMS RACE REPRESENTED THE KEY PARTS OF THE SOVIET PEACE PROGRAM. In our period the arms race and, first and foremost, the nuclear arms race represents the most important source of the threat of war. For, in the nature of things, this is material preparation for war. At the beginning of

the seventies, the accumulation of weapons reached gigantic proportions. As a result of the activities of the United States and NATO countries, the rates of this process continue to grow.

As early as in the first postwar years, the Soviet Union proposed concrete measures for nuclear disarmament. However, at that time the West brushed them off, claiming that the Russians were proposing these measures "in view of their own weakness." The arms race continued. By the beginning of the seventies, it had become clear to everyone: Now the might of socialism is fully comparable to the might of the West. However, the USSR has continued to insist on the implementation of measures aimed at ending the arms race. And this is natural: As Lenin observed, disarmament has been and continues to be the ideal of socialism. (Footnote 17) (V.I. Lenin: "Complete Collected Works," Vol 30, p 152)

The Soviet Peace Program proposed a series of steps aimed AT ENDING THE ARMS RACE AND ESPECIALLY THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE AND AT GRADUALLY REDUCING WEAPONS. This is what it was stated in this connection in the documents of the 24th CPSU Congress:

"To conclude treaties [dogover] banning nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons.

"To strive to stop nuclear weapons tests, including underground tests, everywhere and by all.

"To promote the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world.

"We advocate the nuclear disarmament of all states that possess nuclear weapons and the convening of a conference of the five nuclear powers -- the USSR, the United States, the PRC, France, and Britain -- for this purpose."

And on the questions of ENDING THE ARMS RACE IN GENERAL:

"To activate the struggle for ending all forms of the arms race. We declare ourselves in favor of convening a world conference to discuss disarmament questions in their totality.

"We are in favor of liquidation of foreign military bases. We advocate the reduction of armed forces and arms in the regions where military confrontation is especially dangerous, including, first and foremost, in central Europe.

"We consider it expedient to work out measures that would reduce the probability of an accidental outbreak or deliberate fabrication of military incidents and of their turning into international crises or into wars.

"The Soviet Union is ready to enter into agreements on the reduction of military expenditures, including, first and foremost, military expenditures of big nations." (Footnote 18) ("Documents of the 24th CPSU Congress," p 30)

Guided by these propositions, the Soviet diplomacy carried out an extraordinarily great amount of work in the 1971-75 period. It was possible to achieve certain results. For instance, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction was signed. Thus, an agreement on a complete liquidation of an entire class of dangerous types of weapons was reached for the first time in history. The Treaty on the

Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Weapons (SALT-I) were signed in Moscow on 26 May 1972. The document "The Basic Principles of Negotiations on the Further Limitation of Strategic Offensive Weapons" was signed in Washington on 21 June 1973, and the Soviet-American Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War was signed on 22 June. As was stated in this document, both sides will act in such a manner as to "exclude the outbreak of nuclear war between them and between either of the parties and other countries." (Footnote 19) ("The Soviet Union in the Struggle for Disarmament. Collected Documents." Moscow, 1977, p 129) This was most certainly a big step on the road to peace. It could have become a turning point in the entire postwar development had the United States observed the provisions of the agreement in practice.

The talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe began in Vienna on 10 October 1971.

The new Soviet-American documents, the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and the Protocol to the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, were signed in Moscow on 3 July 1974. The Soviet-British Declaration on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was signed in Moscow on 15 February 1975.

However, these successes by no means marked an end of the arms race. On the contrary, preparations for a qualitatively new round of the arms race were in progress in the United States and NATO under the conditions of detente in the first 5 years of the seventies. The ground was laid for the production of more dangerous and destabilizing types of weapons. At the same time, the negotiations that had begun along several directions were protracted by the Western side. Taking these circumstances into consideration, the 25th CPSU Congress outlined a further program of action aimed at stopping the growing arms race and making a transition to the reduction of accumulated stockpiles of weapons and to disarmament.

Soviet diplomacy continued energetically to work to implement these propositions. And despite the West's growing resistance, it was possible to accomplish a great deal. Thus, in July 1976 an agreement was concluded with France (in the form of an exchange of letters) on the prevention of accidental or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons. The same kind of an agreement between the USSR and Great Britain was concluded in October 1977. In accordance with the proposal made by the USSR, the convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques was signed in May 1977. The confidence-building measures in the military sphere, envisaged by the Helsinki Final Act, were effectively implemented in Europe in the 1976-80 period.

Finally, the working out of the second treaty [Doover] between the USSR and the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons was of principled importance. It was through the fault of the United States that the process of its preparation continued for 6 years. The implementation of this treaty would open up the road to major measures in the sphere of disarmament. However, it turned out in practice that this was the last act of detente in the seventies.

As early in 1975 and at the beginning of 1976, the United States and NATO took a number of steps in an essentially different direction: For instance, they adopted a secret decision on the siting in Europe of new U.S. nuclear missiles (although it was later claimed that these missiles allegedly represented a "response" to the Soviet

SS-20 missiles deployed in the European part of the USSR in the 1976-77 period to replace the missiles of older types). In 1977 the United States determined a new strategy that envisaged the transfer of the main weight of military efforts to the "peripheral" regions (in particular, to Western Europe) in order to remove the threat from the United States itself. In 1978 NATO adopted a program of the arms race calculated for the period to the end of this century. At the beginning of December 1979, the U.S. Administration decided to renounce the ratification of SALT-II treaty (although it subsequently claimed that the events in Afghanistan at the very end of December 1979 were allegedly the reason for this renunciation). Finally, also in December 1979, NATO formally confirmed the decision on siting the new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in the FRG, Britain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands, beginning at the end of 1983.

As a result, the danger of war sharply increased in the world. Therefore, in adopting the Peace Program for the eighties, the 26th CPSU Congress concentrated its attention, first and foremost, on the problems of military detente and ending the arms race. What was involved were the following proposals:

The /first/ concerned the BROADENING OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES IN THE MILITARY SPHERE IN EUROPE. These measures began to be implemented after the CSCE. In the period between the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses, the USSR declared that it was ready to move on this road further than had been agreed upon in Helsinki and, for instance, proposed in this connection that the countries concerned should notify each other not only about the maneuvers of ground forces but also about naval and air force exercises as well as large troop movements. "And now," the CPSU Central Committee's accountability report to the congress stated, "we wish to propose to essentially widen also the zone of the implementation of these measures. WE ARE READY TO EXTEND THEM TO THE ENTIRE EUROPEAN PART OF THE USSR UNDER THE CONDITION THAT THE WESTERN STATES, ON THEIR PART, CORRESPONDINGLY WIDEN THE ZONE OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES."

The /second/ proposal also concerned the CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES, BUT THIS TIME IN RELATION TO ASIA. This is a region where -- naturally taking account of its specific conditions -- the development and implementation of confidence building measures could become a very useful act for strengthening the foundations of general peace. Powers such as the USSR, China, and Japan are neighbors in the Far East. There are U.S. military bases there. "THE SOVIET UNION," it was stated at the congress, "WOULD BE READY TO HOLD CONCRETE NEGOTIATIONS ON CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES IN THE FAR EAST WITH ALL INTERESTED COUNTRIES."

The /third/ proposal concerned such an extraordinarily important problem as the LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC ARMS AND THEIR REDUCTION: "FOR OUR PART WE ARE READY TO CONTINUE WITHOUT DELAY THE APPROPRIATE NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES WHILE PRESERVING EVERYTHING POSITIVE THAT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED IN THIS SPHERE UNTIL NOW. It goes without saying that the negotiations can only be conducted on the basis of equality and equal security. We will not go for any agreement that would give any unilateral advantage to the United States. In our opinion, all other nuclear powers should also join in these negotiations at the proper time."

The /fourth/ proposal was specifically devoted to the problem of the LIMITATION OF NAVAL ARMS: "WE ARE READY TO REACH AN ACCORD ON THE LIMITATION OF THE DEPLOYMENT [RAZVERTYVANIYE] OF NEW SUBMARINES, THAT IS, THE OHIO-TYPE SUBMARINES ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES AND SIMILAR SUBMARINES ON THE PART OF THE USSR. WE COULD ALSO MOVE TOWARD AN ACCORD [DOGOVORENNOST] ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE MODERNIZATION OF THE EXISTING AND THE CREATION OF NEW BALLISTIC MISSILES CARRIED BY THESE SUBMARINES."

The /fifth/ proposal dealt with the NUCLEAR MISSILE ARMS IN EUROPE: "WE PROPOSE," it was declared from the rostrum of the Congress, "TO REACH AN ACCORD ON NOW INTRODUCING A MORATORIUM ON THE SITING IN EUROPE OF NEW MEDIUM-RANGE NUCLEAR MISSILE WEAPONS OF NATO COUNTRIES AND THE USSR, THAT IS, TO QUALITATIVELY AND QUANTITATIVELY FREEZE THE EXISTING LEVEL OF THESE WEAPONS, INCLUDING -- IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING -- ALSO THE U.S. FORWARD-BASED NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THAT REGION. This moratorium could come into effect immediately as soon as the negotiations on this problem begin and then continue to be in effect until a permanent treaty on the limitation or, better yet, on the reduction of these nuclear weapons in Europe is concluded. In this connection we proceed from the assumption that both sides will stop all preparations for the deployment of corresponding additional weapons, including the U.S. land-based Pershing-2 and strategic cruise missiles."

The /sixth/ proposal was a demand for INFORMING THE POPULAR MASSES OF ALL COUNTRIES ABOUT THE DISASTROUS CONSEQUENCES OF A NUCLEAR WAR. The truth about these consequences is being concealed by those who try to claim that nuclear war is allegedly permissible and who are preparing such a war. It was proposed to form an AUTHORITATIVE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF THE VITAL NEED FOR PREVENTING A NUCLEAR CATASTROPHE. The most distinguished scientists of various countries could be members of such a committee. The entire world should be informed about the conclusions made by them.

Finally, the /seventh/ proposal consisted of the following: Many international problems have accumulated in the world and a reasonable solution of these problems would take the heat off the international situation and make it possible for peoples to breathe more easily. But what is needed for this purpose are a far-sighted approach, political will and courage, and authority and influence. "This is why it seems to us," it was stated at the congress, "that it would be USEFUL TO CONVENE A SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL -- WITH THE PARTICIPATION OF THE HIGHEST LEADERS OF THE COUNCIL'S MEMBER-STATES -- TO SEEK THE KEYS TO THE RECOVERY OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND TO THE PREVENTION OF WAR. LEADERS OF OTHER STATES WOULD OBVIOUSLY ALSO BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SESSION IF THEY SO WISHED." (Footnote 20) ("Documents of the 26th CPSU Congress," pp 28-30)

By generalizing the new ideas on the questions of military detente put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress, it is possible to say that what was involved in this connection were honest and clear proposals aimed at searching for mutually acceptable solutions that would in practice open up the road to breaking the vicious circle of the arms race.

The Soviet Peace Program, worked out and developed since 1971, has extended over different stages of development of international relations, that is, the period of the assertion of detente, the period of detente, the period of growing difficulties of detente, and finally the period of intensified confrontation. At times the question is raised: But if this is so, has it been realistic to adhere to one and the same program; would it not be better to change its guidelines? The question is quite legitimate in principle.

In answering it, it is necessary, first and foremost, to emphasize: During this entire period the Soviet Union has continued to pursue the same goals in the international arena. The general line of our foreign policy has not changed. It has aspired and

continues to aspire to strengthening peace, narrowing the area of confrontation, stopping the arms race, and deepening detente. And no matter how the tactics of the imperialist aggressive forces may continue to change, the USSR will never renounce these goals.

There is yet another, quite important circumstance that has conditioned the immutability of the basic ideas of the Soviet Peace Program. It is understandable that the real international situation has demanded that the USSR double its attention to analyzing both the deep factors of world development, the factors that determine our strategy, and the current, temporary factors that influence the determination of some or other tactical steps. The analysis of the deep factors of world development has most manifestly shown that the objective trends determining the general course of world events have not changed. Despite all its efforts, imperialism has not succeeded (and will not succeed!) in changing either the general arrangement or the general correlation of forces in the arena of world politics. If some kind of changes did take place in this sphere, they were oriented in the same direction as earlier, that is, to the detriment of imperialism and the advantage of democratic and peace-loving forces. Therefore, working out the practical steps in the implementation of the Peace Program in the Eighties, our country did not have to change its strategic goals. The main trends of antagonism and the lines of political alliances on the whole remained unchanged.

In this connection it is necessary once again to note: The program of struggle for peace and international cooperation, for freedom and independence of peoples, proclaimed by the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses, and the Peace Program for the Eighties represent one whole. They extend and supplement one another.

In precisely the same way, the main tactical aims of Soviet foreign policy have, in principle, not changed during the past period. The 24th, 25th, and 26th CPSU Congresses confirmed its main tactical principle: **FIRMLY REBUFFING THE AGGRESSIVE LINE OF IMPERIALISM, OUR COUNTRY WILL CONTINUE TO PURSUE ITS PRINCIPLED COURSE AIMED AT CONSOLIDATING PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE, STRENGTHENING AND DEEPENING DETENTE, AND STOPPING THE ARMS RACE.** Of course, depending on the situation, certain changes have occurred in the USSR's foreign policy tactics because it was necessary to react to some or other twists of the policy of imperialism. But the essence of these tactics has remained unchanged.

Each of the basic lines of the Peace Program, put forward in 1971, has continued to further evolve, taking account of the course of events and of changes of external conditions. The purpose of this evolution was to **FORMULATE THE RESPONSE TO THE MOST TOPICAL ISSUES OF A GIVEN PERIOD OF TIME.** The new elements of the program primarily covered those spheres of international politics in which imperialism developed its aggressive activity and where counteraction to imperialism was needed.

The period after the 26th CPSU Congress was especially dynamic, considered from the viewpoint of our foreign policy activeness. Even the enemies of socialism admit: Never before the USSR raised so many ideas in the sphere of foreign policy in such a short span of time. In particular, the following principled proposals were made and initiatives taken:

The proposal (upheld by the 36th session of the UN General Assembly) to proclaim the first use of nuclear weapons a crime against humanity. The USSR declared its renunciation of being the first to use nuclear weapons and appealed to other nuclear powers to follow its example;

The proposals concerning a significant reduction of the nuclear arms arsenals of the USSR and the United States, while observing the principle of equality and equal security of the sides, and the freezing of these arsenals for the duration of the negotiations on their reduction;

The proposals on the prohibition of the development [razmeshcheniye] of any kind of weapons in outer space and the exploitation of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes; on the development of peaceful international cooperation in outer space (which has found support in decisions of the UN General Assembly); unilateral moratorium on the introduction of any types of antisatellite weapons into outer space; the proposal to introduce moratorium on the development [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space-based strike weapons for the entire period of the new Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons which began in Geneva in 1985;

The sum total of proposals concerning the transformation of Europe into a continent free of not only medium-range nuclear weapons but also tactical nuclear weapons and, for the beginning, the substantial reduction in the quantity of medium range nuclear weapons located in Europe. The Soviet-U.S. negotiations on these problems continued for 2 years until the U.S. side broke them off in November 1983. The USSR placed on the negotiating table concrete proposals for accords [dogovoreniya], the realization of which would have led to a 2/3 reduction of the medium-range warheads (on missiles and aircraft) now located in Europe. Only the U.S. unwillingness to renounce its plans for the siting of U.S. missiles in Europe made it impossible to achieve this result; the announcement in April 1985 of the moratorium on the deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles and the suspension of other countermeasures in Europe until November 1985. This moratorium could be extended if the United States suspended [priostanovit] the siting of its missiles in Europe;

The decision to suspend until January 1986 all nuclear explosions, beginning on 6 August 1985, the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, and not to resume them if the United States also suspended its nuclear tests;

the proposals on transforming the Mediterranean Sea into a sea of peace; support for the ideas of creating nuclear-free zones in the Balkans and Northern Europe, and the zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons and the zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe;

The new proposals on ways of settling the situation in the Persian Gulf region and, at a broader level, on the foundations of relations with the liberated Asian and African countries;

the considerations concerning the principles and directions of further efforts to resolve the Middle East crisis; and

The new proposals concerning the future prospects for strengthening peace in Asia on a collective basis.

All the main questions of the international situation and the joint foreign policy line of the socialist community have been discussed at meetings of leaders of the fraternal countries, at sessions of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-countries, at conferences of secretaries of Central Committees of the fraternal parties for international and ideological questions, at sessions of the committee of ministers of foreign affairs of Warsaw Pact countries, and at other meetings of leaders of the foreign policy departments of socialist countries.

The collective proposals of the Warsaw Pact member-countries, adopted at the Prague conference in January 1983 and developed at the Moscow conference of the leaders of socialist countries, are of historic significance. According to general recognition, the proposal on concluding the treaty on non-use of force between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO countries and on developing normal and peaceful relations between them has acquired a special importance. And in this connection the fraternal countries have continued to make their contributions to the general cause of the struggle for peace and detente, and they have made their own proposals that evoked considerable response. Thus, the GDR and the CSSR have put forward a number of considerations on the problems of European peace as well as on disarmament questions. The People's Republic of Bulgaria actively promotes the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans.

The Mongolian People's Republic has made a number of proposals concerning the strengthening of peace on the Asian Continent, and the DRV and the Lao People's Democratic Republic have made a number of proposals concerning peace in Southeast Asia. It would be easy to continue this enumeration further.

It is important to emphasize that precisely the socialist countries, together with developing countries, have authored a majority of proposals concerning questions of peace and security which were considered at UN General Assembly sessions. These proposals have won the wide support of the international society. Only the United States and some of its allies opposed them. But in the final analysis they, too, were compelled to agree with a number of peaceful initiatives.

Much has been already written about the Soviet foreign policy initiatives taken after the 26th CPSU Congress, as well as about the proposals of other countries of the socialist community. Many commentaries note the following main features that are characteristic of these initiatives and proposals:

/First,/ the measures proposed by the USSR and its allies are of an all-embracing nature. They concern nuclear missile and conventional types of weapons and the ground and naval forces and the airforces. They concern the situation in Europe, in the Near and Middle East, and in the Far East. What is involved are measures both of a political and military nature.

/Second,/ these proposals concern the MOST ACUTE QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE. Also involved in this connection are a search for ways of resolving the most serious (and dangerous) conflict situations, efforts to find mutually acceptable possibilities for stopping the most dangerous arms race, that is, the nuclear missile arms race, and the question of removing from Europe the threat of nuclear annihilation that now hangs over it.

/Third,/ all our proposals are REALISTIC and they are based on a consistent implementation of the principle of EQUAL AND IDENTICAL SECURITY for all sides. On no point or

question do the Soviet Union and its friends seek any unilateral gains or advantages for themselves.

/Fourth,/ the Soviet Union strives not only to maintain but also to continue to develop normal relations with all countries. We strive to normalize our relations with the countries with which they have been disrupted for one reason or another.

And finally, /fifth,/ it is important that the proposals of the countries of socialism, following the tradition of the socialist foreign policy founded by Lenin, ARE ADDRESSED BOTH TO GOVERNMENTS AND TO THE POPULAR MASSES, to the entire international public.

The interconnection and interaction between the socialist foreign policy and the vital interests of the popular masses of the entire world reflect an essentially new situation that has developed in the world after the appearance of socialism as a social system. This situation is conditioned by the fact that the socialist states are historically the first stages whose interests and goals as a whole, including the interests and goals in the foreign policy sphere, WHOLLY COINCIDE with the interests of the popular masses. There are the STATES THAT EXPRESS THE WILL OF THEIR PEOPLES. It is precisely as a result of this that the NATIONAL AND STATE INTERESTS OF THE COUNTRIES OF SOCIALISM IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS TURN OUT TO BE IDENTICAL WITH THE INTERESTS OF THE ENTIRE PEACE-LOVING MANKIND. And this becomes apparent, first and foremost, in relation to the question of war and peace.

What is the Soviet foreign policy's contribution to the implementation of the Peace Program?

In the most general form it is possible to single out the following main results of the USSR's foreign policy activity during the period under discussion:

First, SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY HAS MADE AN IMPORTANT NEW CONTRIBUTION TO THE CAUSE OF PROTECTING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE WORKERS CLASS, THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOCIALISM IN OUR COUNTRY AND IN ALL COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM, TO THE CAUSE OF STRENGTHENING THE POSITIONS OF SOCIALISM. We recall in this connection that for several decades, beginning in 1917, the Western world stubbornly refused to recognize the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with opposing social systems. Naturally, in the course of time the Soviet Union had to be recognized and even various agreements had to be concluded with it. But despite this, the Western ruling circles proceeded from the view that, as a social system, socialism should be liquidated. Socialism has not only withstood the most difficult tests, but has also grown stronger and turned into a most important force of the world social development. The continuing changes in the correlation of forces in the world to the advantage of socialism have compelled Western politicians to recognize the principle of peaceful coexistence. Today it has already been confirmed in many interstate documents.

Is not the victory of the peoples of Vietnam and Laos -- a victory that required an enormous strain of forces but was, nevertheless, won -- evidence of the firmness of socialism? And does not socialist Cuba, defending its independence and sovereignty during the long years of direct confrontation with the United States, prove the irreversibility of the achievements of socialism? Is this not also proved by the West's international legal recognition of the GDR which they had refused for nearly 3 decades even to consider as a sovereign state? And the defense of the achievements of socialism in Poland? Now it must be clear to everyone: The achievements of socialism are unshakable. And anyone wanting to test their durability would thereby primarily put to test his own firmness.

Of course, all this does not mean the struggle for peaceful coexistence has already been completed. Recent events have graphically demonstrated that the imperialist forces, first and foremost those in the United States, are de facto renouncing the principle of peaceful coexistence which they recognized in the seventies. They are again casting doubt on the "legality" of socialism. The struggle for peaceful coexistence continues and, at the same time, a struggle for the development of new relations between states is also in progress. New and, at times, very difficult problems are confronting our country and all socialist states in the course of this struggle. Nevertheless, as a result of the road heretofore traversed, the conditions for building socialism and communism in the USSR and in the countries of the entire socialist community have become more favorable.

Second, IN THE SEVENTIES SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY, IN COOPERATION WITH THE FOREIGN POLICIES OF OTHER COUNTRIES OF SOCIALISM AND ALL PEACE-LOVING FORCES, MADE AN IMMENSE CONTRIBUTION TO THE CAUSE OF PROTECTING AND STRENGTHENING PEACE IN THE ENTIRE WORLD.

We note, first and foremost, the fact that the principle of impermissibility of nuclear war and the necessity of excluding it from the life of the world community were jointly fixed by the main capitalist states and the countries of socialism in the accords, agreements, declarations, and protocols and UN decisions during the seventies. It was proclaimed more than once in various forms that the use of force in international relations is impermissible and that hegemonism, the aspiration to capture the positions of supremacy and domination in the world as a whole or in its individual regions, is also impermissible.

The practice of imperialist states very often contradicts these principles. Suffice it to mention the U.S. course aimed at gaining military superiority and its open proclamation of its right to consider some or other regions of the earth as its estate and to give orders with the help of military force wherever it may deem it necessary.

But does this indicate that a proclamation of principles has no meaning at all? Of course not! Only quite recently the Western governments flatly refused to recognize these principles, primarily, the principle of peaceful coexistence. But in the seventies our Western partners directly recognized that peaceful coexistence represents the only possible basis for the development of relations between countries with different social systems.

Of course, the agreements that have been already concluded and the negotiations that are in progress are still of a limited nature. And the decisive stages of the struggle against the arms race still await us because the eighties have been marked by a new intensification of the arms race. This is how it is. And nevertheless, it is impossible not to give its due to the fact that the treaties [dogovor] and agreements [sopimeneniye] which are in effect have closed off some channels of the arms race, have prohibited or limited certain types of weapons, and have set up certain barriers against this race. And this shows that real measures have been achieved in this sphere and that states are able to reach important agreements.

Yet another important circumstance should not be disregarded in this connection. Agreements on permanent political consultations between many states belonging to different social systems were concluded and set in motion for the first time during the seventies. In their totality these agreements represent a mechanism of a special type which makes it possible to hold regular joint discussions not only about urgent problems of bilateral relations but also about important international issues, and

to exchange views whenever conflict situations develop. This is all the more important in view of the fact that, simultaneously with the creation of the mechanism of permanent political consultations, the ideas of equal and mutually beneficial cooperation between the socialist and the capitalist countries in the spheres of economy, science, and culture are also assuming international-level and practical forms on an increasingly wider scale.

Taken separately, each of these achievements is of principled significance. But, considered in their totality and their interconnection, they really make it possible to speak about an opportunity for moving closer to a stage in the development of international relations at which a consistent struggle of peoples for peace and the united forces of all peace-loving states, organizations, and parties will be able in practice to achieve reliable and durable changes in the political climate of the planet. It goes without saying that many efforts will still have to be made for this purpose because the opponents of peace are strong and active.

Third, THE SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY HAS ONCE AGAIN MADE A GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEFENSE OF THE RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OF ALL PEOPLES, PRIMARILY TO THE DEFENSE OF THEIR INALIENABLE RIGHT TO AN AUTONOMOUS DETERMINATION OF THEIR OWN FATE AND TO THEIR ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE.

In the new historical situation following the disintegration of colonial empires, the foreign policy of the USSR and of the entire socialist community has played and continues to play a significant role in the cause of defending the liberated countries against aggression by the imperialist states and the reactionary and racist regimes. The countries of socialism also provide direct military aid to the sovereign states which are subjected to aggression and are defending their freedom, independence, and territorial integrity, and to the peoples who are waging their liberation and anti-colonial struggle.

Fourth, DURING RECENT YEARS SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY HAS PLAYED AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN ACTIVATING ALL FORCES THAT WORK FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY AND HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN DRAWING ON AN INCREASINGLY BROAD SCALE EVER NEW MASSES OF PEOPLE IN ALL PARTS OF OUR PLANET INTO THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND FOR PEACE.

The participation of the masses in solving the problems of world politics is an important factor of contemporary international life. This participation has found its expression in the broadest public support on all continents for strengthening detente and in the mass campaigns of solidarity with the peoples struggling for their national and social liberation. It goes without saying that the antiwar movement that has now become especially strong in Western Europe and also in the United States is not the product of some kind of "interference" on the part of socialism, as some people in the West are saying. It is the result of the popular masses' realization of the threat of a world war. At the same time, it is impossible to deny that socialist diplomacy's consistent line aimed at defending peace and unmasking the aggressive actions of imperialism has contributed to a rise in the activeness of the broadest and most multifaceted social forces, which have now become an important factor of the struggle for a continuation of detente.

And finally, fifth, THE FOREIGN POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF THE USSR AND THE COUNTRIES OF THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY HAS LED TO A DEEPENING DIFFERENTIATION IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD AS FAR AS THE QUESTIONS OF WAR AND PEACE AND THE QUESTIONS OF RELATIONS WITH THE COUNTRIES OF SOCIALISM ARE CONCERNED. The struggle between different positions on these problems, which had developed in the West long ago, has assumed especially

active forms recently. And it is an important fact that the forces advocating the development of normal relations between the countries with different social systems are gaining strength in the course of this struggle.

Thus, it is possible to conclude that the USSR's activity in implementing the Peace Program has made it possible to preserve peace and that, to a certain degree, it has foiled the plans of the aggressive imperialist circles. It has united the efforts of peace-loving states and of all social forces working for the prevention of a new war. The decisions of the 24th, 25th, and 26th CPSU Congresses have been steadfastly implemented and continue to be implemented. The line of struggle for peace and for the prevention of nuclear war is embodied in the practical steps and measures of the Soviet country and the entire socialist community.

COPYRIGHT: Izdateistvo "Nauka", "Obshchestvennyye nauki", 1985

/6091

CSO: 5200/1186

RELATED ISSUES

FRG'S BAHR, USSR'S TOLKUNOV COMMENT ON RELATIONS

LD121759 Hamburg DPA in German 1606 GMT 12 Dec 85

[Text] Bonn, 12 Dec (DPA) -- SPD disarmament expert Egon Bahr believes that the West European countries cannot delegate the responsibility for their security to others. At a German-Soviet conference of the SPD-linked Fredrick-Ebert Foundation in Bonn today, Bahr said that if the two superpowers sat down at a table to discuss security issues the European governments must do the same.

Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Lev Tolkunov pointed to the grave threat to Europe's security posed by a militarization of space. He said that the security issue continues to be the "central element of relations" between Bonn and Moscow.

Bahr strongly rejected reproaches of German revanchism and offensive intentions on the part of NATO and the Bundeswehr made by the Soviet side at the conference. He said that such statements seem like taking an axe to the roots of the German-Soviet treaty signed 15 years ago.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2580

RELATED ISSUES

CANADIAN PUGWASH GROUP URGES NUCLEAR-WEAPONS FREEZE

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 6 Nov 85 p A3

[Text]

OTTAWA

The Canadian Pugwash group has sent a Telex to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney urging that Canada reverse its position at the United Nations and vote in favor of a nuclear-weapons freeze.

The group also wants Canada to introduce resolutions at the UN calling for strict adherence to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty — which some feel is being violated by the U.S. strategic defence initiative — and for the elimination of anti-satellite weapons systems.

The Telex was sent to both Mr. Mulroney and External Affairs Minister Joe Clark Monday night, after a meeting in Toronto of the Canadian Pugwash group, which links scientists, intellectuals, former diplomats and Government officials interested in world issues.

The Canadian group has for several years joined with the worldwide Pugwash movement (named after a Second World War conference in Pugwash, N.S.) in urging a nuclear weapons freeze, according to the New York-based Pugwash chairman and disarmament expert, William Epstein.

In the Commons yesterday, the New Democratic Party's external affairs critic, Pauline Jewett, urged the Government to join the so-called

"five-continent peace initiative" whose leaders have also called for a nuclear-weapons ban.

India, Sweden, Argentina, Greece, Mexico and Tanzania have proposed that the non-aligned nations monitor nuclear tests to determine whether there are any violations of a test ban.

Mr. Clark said the Government believes Canada should continue in its traditional roles, particularly as preparations intensify for the first summit meeting of superpower leaders in six years.

"That means, of course, that we want to pursue very vigorously initiatives and opportunities open for us" at such forums as the Stockholm conference on confidence-building measures and the mutual and balanced force reduction talks in Vienna.

The Liberals and NDP both favor a nuclear freeze. But, at the UN last November, the Conservative Government's disarmament ambassador, Douglas Roche, voted against a freeze, echoing the NATO argument that it would freeze the imbalance of forces in Western Europe to the Warsaw Pact's advantage.

The Pugwash Telex says it is only logical to first stop the nuclear arms race and then to proceed to

/9317

CSO: 5220/21

RELATED ISSUES

CANADIAN DEMONSTRATORS RALLY AGAINST ARMS RACE

Toronto THE SUNDAY STAR in English 27 Oct 85 p A2

[Article by Paul Bilodeau]

[Text]

**"What do we want? — PEACE!
When do we want it? — NOW!"**

A cheering chorus of teenaged peaceniks linked arm-in-arm led thousands of marchers through downtown Toronto yesterday to protest the international arms race.

They joined thousands more who marched in London and the Netherlands, where Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers was jeered amid a crowd of 25,000 protesting the deployment of cruise missiles.

Lubbers' cabinet is to decide Friday whether Holland will join other NATO members to allow the missiles to be based on its territory.

Lubbers said the issue was to reduce nuclear weapons worldwide, not just in the Netherlands, and that the cabinet would almost certainly go ahead with deployment.

In London, 80,000 people took part in an anti-nuclear rally yesterday, called the biggest in Europe this year by organizers.

Die-in

Protestors, led by Glenys Kinnock, wife of opposition Labour party leader Neil Kinnock, skirted both the U.S. and Soviet embassies, before staging a four-minute "die-in" — falling to the ground simultaneously to suggest the outcome of a nuclear attack on the city.

For the first time Toronto peace activists had something to celebrate: Victory in helping dissuade the Canadian government from direct participation in the "Star Wars" space weapons research.

Wendy Wright, of the Toronto Disarmament Network, told the cheering throng at Queen's Park that the Canadian peace movement affected government policy by presenting a well-documented case against the research.

The peace movement should take credit for "backing (Prime Minister) Brian Mulroney into a corner and forcing him to make a decision that he was really against in principle," Wright said.

Political solution

Organizers estimated the crowd at about 10,000, although Metro police estimated barely 2,500. At one point, the parade of people 10 abreast had stretched almost the full 10 blocks of Yonge St., from Bloor St. to College St.

Toronto columnist June Callwood conducted the afternoon rally, which was highlighted by folksingers, a rock band and the San Francisco-based Ladies Against Women comedy troupe.

The rally's theme — End the Arms Race, Feed the World — was a tie-in with the highly successful Live Aid rock concert, which netted \$50 million for food aid for Africa this summer.

"The arms race spends that much money in an hour," Wright told the crowd.

The Walk for Peace was sponsored by the Toronto Disarmament Network, a coalition of 81 labor, church, political, anti-apartheid and peace groups.

Quakers, United Church of Canada groups and Catholic high school students paraded with Communist Party of Canada stalwarts and pressure groups for many international, anti-American and anti-Soviet political causes.

/9317

CSO: 5220/21

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

15 January 1986